

##50##000f000f#.######00#####00#####00#####
#####0#####0#####0###1#####1#####1#####1#####1#####1#####0000
###E#####E#####E#####E#####Y###0###E#####0\$##0###= #####= #####=
#####= #####= #####!#####!#####!
#####0\$#####2\$#####2\$#####2\$#####2\$#####2\$#####2\$###&###0###a)##0###V\$
##Q#####1#####!#####!#####!#####!#####!
#####V\$#####1#####1#####= #####=
##0###0\$#####0#####0#####0#####!##J###1#####= #####1#####=
#####0\$#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####!
#####0\$#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####
#####0#####0#####
#####0000####p#0b000#####0000####b###0###0#####\$#####0\$##0###0\$
#####0#####*#####0#####*#####0#####
#####*#####1#####0### #####!#####!
#####0#####!#####!#####!#####!#####!#####!
#####V\$#####V\$#####0#####
#####!#####!#####!#####0\$#####!#####!#####!#####!
#####0000####0000####0000#####0000####0000####0000####0000####00
00####0000####0000####0000####0000####0000####0000####0000####0000####*
#####!#####!#####!#####!#####!#####!
#####!#####!#####!#####!#####!#####!
#####0###Y

##0###:#####

#####Magistri Petri Lombardi#Arch. Episc. Parisiensis#Master
Peter Lombard#Archbishop of Paris##Sententiarum Quatuor Libri#The Four Books of
Sentences##LIBER PRIMUS SENTENTIARUM.0DE DEI UNITATE ET TRINITATE#THE FIRST BOOK
OF THE SENTENCES0ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY OF GOD##DISTINCTIO XVII.#DISTINCTION
17##Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 287-291.#Cum
Notitiis Editorum Quaracchi#Latin text taken from Opera Omnia S.
Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 287-291.#Notes by the Quaracchi
Editors.##0PARS. I.#0PART I##Cap. I.00Quod Spiritus sanctus est caritas, qua
diligimus Deum et proximum.#Chapter I.That the Holy Spirit is the charity, by
which we love God and neighbor.##Iam nunc accedamus ad assignandam missionem
Spiritus sancti, qua invisibiliter mittitur in corda fidelium. 0Nam ipse
Spiritus sanctus, qui Deus est ac tertia in Trinitate persona, ut supra ostensum
est,1 a Patre et Filio ac se ipso temporaliter procedit, id est, mittitur ac
donatur fidelibus. 0Sed quae sit ista missio sive donatio, vel quomodo fiat,
considerandum est.#Moreover [Iam] let us now proceed to assign the mission of
the Holy Spirit, by which He is invisibly sent into the hearts of the faithful.
For the Holy Spirit Himself, who is God and the Third Person in the Trinity, as
has been shown above,1 proceeds from the Father and the Son and Himself
temporally, that is, is sent and granted to the faithful. 0But what is that
mission or donation of His, and/or in what manner it comes to be, must be
considered.##Hoc autem ut intelligibilius doceri ac plenius perspicui valeat,
praemittendum est quiddam ad hoc valde necessarium. 0Dictum quidem est supra et
sacris auctoritatibus ostensum,2 quod Spiritus sanctus amor est Patris et Filii,
quo se invicem amant et nos. 0His autem addendum est, quod ipse idem Spiritus
sanctus est amor sive caritas, qua nos diligimus Deum et proximum. 0Quae
caritas, cum ita est in nobis, ut nos faciat diligere Deum et proximum, tunc
Spiritus sanctus dicitur mitti vel dari3 nobis; et qui diligit ipsam
dilectionem, qua diligit proximum, in eo ipso Deum diligit, quia ipsa dilectio
Deus est,4 id est Spiritus sanctus.#Moreover [autem] so that this may be able to
be more intelligibly taught and more fully examined [perspicui], there must be
aforementioned a certain something [quiddam] very necessary for this. 0It has
indeed been said above and shown by sacred authorities,2 that the Holy Spirit is
the Love [amor] of the Father and the Son, by which They love [amant] one
another and us. 0Moreover, it must be added to these, that the very same Holy
Spirit is the Love or Charity, by which we love [diligimus] God and neighbor.
When this Charity is so great in us, that it makes us love God and neighbor, the
Holy Spirit is then said to be sent and/or to be given3 to us; and he who loves
the very love [dilectionem], by which he loves (his) neighbor, in this very
(thing) loves God, because Love itself is God,4 that is, the Holy Spirit.##Ne
autem in re tanta aliquid de nostro influere5 videamur, sacris auctoritatibus
quod dictum est corroboremus.0 De hoc Augustinus in octavo libro de Trinitate6
ait:0 0 Qui proximum diligit, consequens est, ut ipsam praecipue dilectionem
diligat. 0Deus autem dilectio est.0 Consequens ergo est, ut praecipue Deum
diligat 0.0 Item in eodem:70 0 Deus dilectio est, ut ait Ioannes Apostolus.0 Ut
quid ergo imus et currimus in sublimia caelorum et ima terrarum, quaerentes eum
qui est apud nos, si nos velimus esse apud eum 0? 00 Nemo dicat:0 non novi, quid
diligam.0 Diligat fratrem et diligat eandem dilectionem. 0Magis enim novit
dilectionem, qua diligit, quam fratrem, quem diligit. 0Ecce iam potes notio-
rem Deum habere quam fratrem, plane notio-rem, quia praesentio-rem, quia interio-
rem, quia certio-rem.0 Amplectere dilectionem Deum8 et dilectione amplectere Deum.0
Ipsa est dilectio, quae omnes bonos Angelos et omnes Dei servos consociat
vinculo sanctitatis. 0Quanto igitur saniores9 sumus a tumore superbiae, tanto
sumus dilectione pleniores:0 et quo nisi Deo plenus est qui plenus est
dilectione 0.0 His verbis satis ostendit Augustinus, quod dilectio ipsa, qua
diligimus Deum vel proximum, Deus est. 0Sed adhuc apertius in eodem libro10
subdit dicens:0 0 Dilectionem fraternam quantum commendat Ioannes Apostolus,

attendamus. Qui diligit, inquit, fratrem in lumine manet, et scandalum in eo non est. Manifestum est, quod iustitiae perfectionem in fratris dilectione posuerit. Nam in quo scandalum non est utique perfectus est. Et tamen videtur, dilectionem Dei tacuisse, quod nunquam faceret, nisi quia in ipsa fraterna dilectione vult intelligi Deum. Apertissime enim in eadem Epistola paulo post dicit ita: Dilectissimi, diligamus invicem, quia dilectio ex Deo est: et omnis qui diligit, ex Deo natus est et cognovit Deum. Qui non diligit non cognovit Deum, quia Deus dilectio est. Ista contextio satis aperte declarat, eandem ipsam fraternam dilectionem nam fraterna dilectio est qua diligimus invicem non solum ex Deo, sed etiam Deum esse tanta auctoritate praedicari, scilicet Ioannis. Cum ergo de dilectione diligimus fratrem, de Deo diligimus fratrem, nec fieri potest, ut eandem dilectionem non praecipue diligamus, qua fratrem diligimus, quoniam Deus dilectio est. Item: Qui non diligit fratrem non est in dilectione; et qui non est in dilectione non est in Deo, quia Deus dilectio est. Ecce apertissime dicit, fraternam dilectionem Deum esse.

Moreover, lest in so great a matter we seem to pour in something of ourselves, let us corroborate what has been said. Of this (St.) Augustine in the eighth book On the Trinity⁶ says: It follows that [consequens est], he who loves (his) neighbor, loves chiefly that love. But God is love. Therefore it follows, that he chiefly loves God. Likewise in the same: God is Love, as (St.) John the Apostle says. How, therefore, are we, as the lowest (of creatures), to run both unto the heights [sublimia] of the heavens and to the lowest (parts) of the earth, seeking Him who is among us, if we would want to be with Him? No one says: I know not, what I love. Let him love (his) brother and let him love the same love. For he knows [novit] more the love, by which he loves, than the brother, whom he loves. Behold you can already have God more known [notiorem] than (your) brother, plainly more known, because more present, because more within, because more certain. Embrace the God Love⁸ and embrace God with love. It is Love Itself, which unites together [consociat] all the good Angels and all the servants of God with the chain [vinculo] of holiness. Therefore as much as we are healed more [saniores]⁹ from the tumor of pride, so much are we more full with Love: of which, if not of God, he also is full who is full of love. With these words (St.) Augustine sufficiently shows, that the very Love, by which we love God and/or neighbor, is God. But still more openly in the same book¹⁰ he adds below this, saying: Let us attend to fraternal love, as much as the Apostle (St.) John commends it. He who loves, he says,¹¹ (his) brother remains in the light, and in him there is no scandal. It is manifest, that in the love of (one's) brother there is posited the perfection of justice. For he in him whom there is no scandal is indeed perfect. And yet it seems, that he is silent about the love of God, which he would never do, unless because he wants God to be understood in that fraternal love. For most openly does he say in that Epistle,¹² a little after this, thus: Most beloved, let us love one another, because love is from God [ex Deo]: and everyone who loves, has been born of God and cognizes God. He who does not love does not cognize God, because God is Love. This passage [contextio] declares in a sufficiently open manner, that the very same fraternal love for fraternal love is that whereby we love one another (is) not only from God, but even is preached to be God by such a great authority, namely (St.) John. When, therefore we love (our) brother from Love,¹³ we love (our) brother from [de] God, nor can it come about, that we do not love chiefly the same Love, by which we love (our) brother, since God is Love. Likewise:¹⁴ He who does not love (his) brother is not in love; and he who is not in love is not in God, because God is Love. Behold he most openly¹⁵ says, that God is fraternal Love.

Cap. II. Quod fraterna dilectio est Deus, nec Pater vel Filius, sed tantum Spiritus sanctus. Chapter II. That fraternal love is God, and not the Father and/or the Son, but only the Holy Spirit. Cum autem fraterna dilectio sit Deus, nec Pater est nec Filius, sed tantum Spiritus sanctus, qui proprie in Trinitate dilectio vel caritas dicitur. Unde Augustinus. . . Moreover, since fraternal Love is God, He is neither the Father nor the Son, but only the Holy Spirit, who in the Trinity is properly said (to be) Love and/or Charity. Whence (St.) Augustine. . .

Dist. XV. c. 1. Immediate post cod. E et Vat. semetipso pro se ipso. Dist. X. Paulo ante edd. 1, 2 quoddam pro quiddam.

30 Codd. A C donari.40 I. Ioan. 4, 8. 16.0 Vulgata:0 Deus caritas est.0 Magister sequitur lectionem Augustini.0 00 Hic incipit Magister exponere suam sententiam, ut falsam communiter reprobata, quae caritatem ut habitum creatum negat; de quo vide S. Bonaventuram, hic p. I. a. 1.50 Sola Vat. astruere.60

Cap. 7. n. 10.0 00 Immediate ante Augustinus edd. 1, 8 addunt autem.70 Ibid. n. 11; textus Scripturae est I. Ioan. 4, 16.0 00 Proximus locus Augustinis est loc. cit. et c. 8. n. 12.80 Ed. 5. Dei.0 00 Deinde ed. 1 post amplectere legit proximum pro Deum.9 0Edd. 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9 falso sanctiores, et cod. C fortiores; ut corrigatur hic error, edd. 1, 8 cum codd. B C D E prosequuntur sic:0 sanctiores sumus, quando a tumore superbiae inaniore (cod. C saniores); sed nostra lectio est secundum textum Augustini, cod. A et Vat. cum edd. 3, 6, 7.100 Loc. cit. paulo infra.0 00 Sola Vat. omittit dicens.110 I. Ioan. 2, 10.0 00 Paulo ante post dilectionem edd. 3, 7, 9, omisso fraternam, ponunt quam pro quantum, et cum codd. A C D et ed. 6 commendat pro commendet.120 Cap. 4, 7. 9.0 Vulgata:0 Carissimi, diligamus nos invicem:0 quia caritas ex Deo est.0 Et omnis, qui diligit, ex Deo natus est et cognoscit Deum. 0Qui non diligit, non novit Deum:0 quoniam Deus caritas est.0 00 Mox Vat. cum plurimis edd. ait 0pro dicit; insuper post dicit edd. 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, variata interpunctione, male tahunt particulam ita ad verba sequentia. 0Denique ed. 1 dulcissimi pro dilectissimi. 130 Solummodo edd. 1, 3 Dei.140 Loc. cit., sed paulo infra.150 Vat. cum aliis edd., contradicentibus codd. et edd. 1, 8, aperte; immediate post edd. 3, 7 dixit pro dicit.##10 Distinction XV, ch. 1.0 00 Immediately after this codex E and the Vatican edition have His very self [semetipso] for Himself [se ipso].20 Distinction X.0 00 A little before this edition 1 and 2 have a certain something [quoddam] for a certain something [quiddam].30 Codices A and C read to be granted [donari].40 1 Jn. 4:8,6.0 The Vulgate reads:0 God is charity [Deus caritas est]. 0Master (Peter) follows the reading of (St.) Augustine.0 00 Here Master (Peter) begins to expound his own sentence, commonly reprov'd as false, which denies that charity is a created habit; concerning which see St. Bonaventur, here in p. I, a. 1.50 Only the Vatican edition has add 0[astruere] for pour it [influere].60 Chapter 7, n. 10.0 00 Immediately before of this (St.) Augustine [Augustinus] editions 1 and 8 add Moreover [autem].70 Ibid., n. 11.0 The text of Scripture is 1 Jn. 4:16. 000 The next passage from (St.) Augustine is loc. cit. and ch. 8, n. 12.80 Edition 5 reads the love of God [dilectionem Dei].0 00 Then edition 1 after embrace [amplectere] reads (your) neighbor [proximum] for God [Deum].90 Editions 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 and 9, falsely read more holier [sanctiores], and codex C more stronger [fortiores]; to correct the this error, editions 1 and 8, together with codices B C D and E proceed thus: we are more holy when more empty of (codex C reads more healed from [saniores]) the tumor of pride [sanctiores sumuis, quando a tumore superbiae inaniore]; but our reading is according to the text of (St.) Augustine, codex A and the Vatican editions, together with editions 3, 6, and 7.100 Loc. cit., a little further below. 000 The Vatican edition alone omits saying [dicens].110 1 Jn. 2:10.0 00 A little before this, at fraternal love [Dilectionem fraternam] editions 3, 7 and 8, having omitted fraternal [fraternam] put which [quam] in place of as much as 0[quantum], and together with codices A C D and edition 6 read commends [commendat] in the indicative.120 1 Jn. 4:7,9.0 The Vulgate reads:0 Dearest ones, let us love one another. 0because charity is of [ex] God.0 And everyone, who loves, has been born of God and cognizes God. 0He who does not love, knows not God:0 since God is charity [Carissimi, diligamus nos invicem:0 quia caritas ex Deo est.0 Et omnis, qui diligit, ex Deo natus est et cognoscit Deum. 0Qui non diligit, non novit Deum:0 quoniam Deus caritas est]. 0000 Then the Vatican edition together with very many editions reads says [ait] for says [dicit]; moreover after says [dicit], editions 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9, with a varied punctuation, badly set aside the particle thus [ita] with the quotation.0 Then edition 1 has Sweetest ones [dulcissimi] for Most beloved [dilectissimi].130 Only editions 1 and 3 have with the love of God [Dei dilectionem].140 Loc. cit., but a little further below.150 The Vatican edition, together with the other editions, with the codices and editions 1 and 8 contradicting it, reads openly [aperte] for most openly [apertissime]; immediately after this editions 3 and 7 have said [dixit] for says [dicit].###p. 288in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate:10 0 Si in donis Dei nihil maius est caritate, et nullum est maius

donum Dei quam Spiritus sanctus, quid consequentius est, quam ut ipse sit caritas, quae dicitur et Deus et ex Deo 2? 2 Ita enim ait Ioannes:2 Dilectio ex Deo est; et paulo post: Deus dilectio est. Ubi manifestat, eam se dixisse dilectionem Deum, quam dixit ex Deo. Deus ergo ex Deo est dilectio 2. Item in eodem:3 Ioannes volens de hac re apertius loqui: In hoc, inquit, cognoscimus, quia in ipso manemus et ipse in nobis, quia de Spiritu suo dedit nobis. Spiritus itaque sanctus, de quo dedit nobis, facit nos in Deo manere et ipsum in nobis; hoc autem facit dilectio. Ipse est igitur Deus dilectio. Ipse ergo4 significatur, ubi legitur: Deus dilectio est 2. Ex hic apparet, quod Spiritus sanctus caritas est.##in the fifteenth book On the Trinity:10 If among the gifts of God nothing is greater than charity, and nothing is a greater gift of God than the Holy Spirit, what follows more [quid consequentius est], than that He Himself is the Charity, which is said (to be) both God and from [ex] God 2? 2 For thus says (St.) John:2 Love is from God [ex Deo]: and a little afterwards: God is Love. Where he manifests, that that Love, which is out of God, means God. Therefore the God from [ex] God is Love 2. Likewise in the same:3 (St.) John, wanting to speak more openly of this matter says: In this we cognize, that we remain in Him and He in us, because He has given us of His Spirit [de Spiritu suo]. And so the Holy Spirit, of Whom He has given us, makes us remain in God and Him in us; but love does this. Therefore He Himself is the God Love. Therefore He4 Himself is signified, where there is read: God is Love 2. From these it appears, that the Holy Spirit is charity.##Cap. III. Quod non est dictum per causam illud: Deus caritas est, sicut illud: Tu es patientia mea et spes mea.##Chapter III. That this (verse): God is charity, has not been said in the manner of [per] a cause, as this (verse): Thou art my patience and my hope.##Sed ne forte aliquis dicat, illud esse dictum per expressionem causae: Deus caritas est, eo scilicet quod caritas sit ex Deo et5 non sit ipse Deus, sicut dicitur: Deus nostra patientia est et spes, non quod ipse sit ista, sed quia ista ex Deo sunt; occurrit Augustinus ostendens, non hoc esse dictum per causam, sicut illa, in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate6 ita dicens: Non dicturi sumus, caritatem non propterea esse dictam Deum, quod ipsa caritas sit una substantia, quae Dei digna sit nomine, sed quod donum sit Dei, sicut dictum est7 Deo: Tu es patientia mea. Non utique ideo dictum est, quod Dei substantia est nostra patientia, sed quia ab ipso nobis est. Unde alibi:8 Ab ipso est patientia mea. Hunc enim sensum facile refellit Scripturarum ipsa locutio. Tale est enim: Tu es patientia mea, quale est: Domine spes mea,9 et: Deus meus misericordia mea, et multa similia. Non est autem dictum: Domine caritas mea, aut: tu es caritas mea, aut: Deus caritas mea; sed ita dictum est:10 Deus caritas est, sicut dictum est: Deus spiritus est. Hoc qui non discernit intellectum a Domino, non expositionem quaerat a nobis; non enim apertius quidquam possumus dicere. Deus ergo caritas est 2. Ex praedictis clarescit, quod Spiritus sanctus caritas est, qua diligimus Deum et proximum; unde facilius est nobis ostendere, quodmodo Spiritus sanctus mittatur sive detur nobis.##But lest perhaps someone say, that there has been said through the expression of a cause, this: God is charity, for the reason, that is, that charity is from [ex] God and5 is not God Himself, just as there is said: God is our patience and hope, not because He Himself is those (virtues) of ours, but because those of ours are from [ex] God; (St.) Augustine opposes this [occurrit] showing, that this has not been said in the manner of [per] a cause, just as that (has been), in the fifteenth book On the Trinity,6 saying thus: We are not going to say, that charity is not on this account said (to be) God, because charity itself is one substance, which is worthy of the name of God, but because it is a gift of God, just as there has been said to God:7 Thou art my patience. Not indeed, for that reason, has it been said, that the Substance of God is our patience, but because ours is from Him. Whence (he says) elsewhere:8 From Him is our patience. For this sense does the very discourse [locution] of the Scriptures easily refute. For such is: Thou art my patience, as is: Lord, my patience,9 and: My God, my mercy, and many similar (verses). But there is not said: God my charity, or: Thou art my charity, or: God, my charity; but it has been said thus:10 God is charity, just as there has been said: God is spirit. Let the one, who separates [discernit] his understanding from the Lord, not seek an exposition from us; for we cannot say anything more openly. Therefore God is

charity. From the aforesaid it grows clear, that the Holy Spirit is the Charity, whereby we love God and neighbor; whence it is more easy for us to show, in what manner the Holy Spirit is sent or given to us.##Cap. IV. Quomodo Spiritus sanctus mittatur vel detur nobis. #Chapter IV. In what manner the Holy Spirit is sent and/or given to us.##Tunc enim mitti vel dari illi dicitur, cum ita in nobis est, ut faciat nos diligere Deum et proximum, per quod manemus in Deo et Deus in

nobis. Unde Augustinus hunc missionis modum insinuans in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate¹² ait: Deus Spiritus sanctus, qui procedit ex Deo, cum datus fuerit homini, accendit eum ad diligendum Deum et proximum, et ipse dilectio est. Non enim habet homo, unde Deum diligat, nisi ex Deo. Ecce quomodo datur vel mittitur nobis Spiritus sanctus, secundum quod dicitur datum sive donum. Quod donum Augustinus commendat explanans apertius, quomodo detur, in eodem libro:¹³ Dilectio, inquit, Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris, ut ait Apostolus, per Spiritum sanctum, qui datus est nobis. Nullum est isto Dei dono excellentius. Solum¹⁴ est, quod dividit inter filios regni et filios perditionis. Dantur et alia per Spiritum munera, sed sine caritate nihil prosunt. Nisi ergo tantum impertiatur cuiquam Spiritus sanctus, ut eum Dei et proximi faciat amatorem, a sinistra¹⁵ non transfertur ad dexteram. Nec Spiritus sanctus proprie dicitur donum nisi propter dilectionem, quam qui non habuerit, etsi loquatur omnibus linguis, et habuerit prophetiam et omnem scientiam et omnem fidem, et distribuerit omnem substantiam suam, et tradiderit corpus suum, ita ut ardeat, nihil ei prodest.¹⁶ Quantum ergo bonum est, sine quo ad aeternam vitam neminem tanta bona perducunt? Ipsa vero dilectio vel caritas nam unius rei nomen est utrumque perducit ad regnum. Dilectio igitur, quae ex Deo est et Deus,¹⁷ proprie Spiritus sanctus est, per quem diffunditur in cordibus nostris Deus caritas, per quam nos tota inhabitat Trinitas. Quocirca rectissime Spiritus sanctus, cum sit Deus, vocatur etiam donum Dei. Quod donum proprie quid nisi caritas intelligendum est, quae perducit ad Deum, et sine qua quodlibet aliud Dei donum non perducit ad Deum? Ecce hic aperitur, quod supra dictum erat,¹⁸ scilicet quod . . . #For He is then said to be sent and/or given,¹¹ when He is in us such, that He makes us love God and neighbor, through which we remain in God and God in us. Whence (St.) Augustine, hinting at this manner of mission, in the fifteenth book On the Trinity,¹² says: God the Holy Spirit, who proceeds out of God, when He has been given to men, enkindles [accendit] him to love God and neighbor, and He Himself is love. For a man [homo] has not, whence to love God, except from [ex] God. Behold in what manner there is given and/or sent to us the Holy Spirit, according to which He is said (to be) a given or a gift. Which gift (St.) Augustine commends, explaining more openly, in what manner He is given, in the same book:¹³ The love of God, he says has been poured forth in our hearts, as the Apostle says, through the Holy Spirit, who has been given to us. Nothing is more excellent than that gift of God. It alone is,¹⁴ that which divides between the sons of the Kingdom and the sons of perdition. Other gifts [munera] are also given through the Spirit, but without charity they profit [prosunt] nothing. Therefore, unless the Holy Spirit be imparted to anyone, to make him a lover of God and neighbor, he¹⁵ is not transferred from the left hand (of Christ) to the right hand. Nor is the Holy Spirit properly said (to be) a gift [donum] except on account of the love, which the one who has not, even if he speaks every tongue, and has prophecy and every knowledge [scientiam] and every faith, and would distribute all his substance, and hand his body over, such that it burn, it profits him nothing.¹⁶ How great, therefore, a good it is, without which such great goods lead no one thoroughly to eternal life? But that very love and/or charity for of the one thing is each name leads thoroughly to the Kingdom. Therefore the love, which is out of God and (is)¹⁷ God, is properly the Holy Spirit, through whom there is poured forth in our hearts the God Charity, through which the whole Trinity indwells in us. Wherefore most rightly is the Holy Spirit, since He is God, called even the gift of God. What must be properly understood (to be) that gift, except the charity, which leads thoroughly to God, and without which whatever other gift of God does not lead thoroughly to God? Behold here there is revealed [aperitur], what had been said above,¹⁸ that is, that##10 Cap. 19. n. 37. Proximus locus Augustini

est loc. cit. c. 17. n. 31; sed initium eius a Magistro est contractum, insuper plura verba mutata sunt.²⁰ I. Ioan. 4, 7-8.^{0 00} Vat. sola legit:⁰ Et in eodem pro paulo post, e contra eadem infra habet paulo post loco in eodem.³⁰ Cap. 17. n. 31.^{0 00} Ibidem codd. A B C post eodem addunt Augustinus. ⁰⁰⁰ Locus Scripturae est loc. cit. v. 13.⁰⁰ Vulgata:⁰ In hoc cognoscimus, quoniam in eo manemus et ipse in nobis:⁰ quoniam de Spiritu suo dedit nobis. ⁰Codd. A B C E et ed. 5 cognovimus.⁴⁰ Supple cum ed. 1:⁰ Spiritus.^{0 00} Paulo ante Vat. cum nonnullis edd.:⁰ Ipse est ergo pro igitur. ⁰Deinde post ex his Vat. et edd. 4, 5, 8, 9 addunt ergo.⁵⁰ Sola Vat. omittit et.⁰ Paulo post edd. 5, 8 ex eo loco ex Deo.⁶⁰ Cap. 17. n. 27.⁰ Mox solummodo Vat. et. ed. 6 cum cod. C omittunt ita.^{0 00} Deinde in ipso textu Augustini post dictari sumus edd. 1, 8 adiciunt (ut quidam dicunt).⁷⁰ Psalm. 70, 5.^{0 00} Hic Vat. et. edd. 5, 8, 9 cum cod. E addunt de ante Deo. ⁰⁰⁰ Paulo infra post dictum est, Vat. cum aliis edd. repetit:⁰ Tu es patientia mea, refragantibus codd., ed. 1 et originali.⁸⁰ Psalm. 61, 6. ⁰⁰⁰ Mox solummodo edd. 1, 8 legunt:⁰ statim refellit pro facile refellit.⁹⁰ Psalm. 90, 9; et sequens textus est Psalm. 58, 18.¹⁰⁰ I. Ioan. 4, 16, et mox:⁰ Ioan. 4, 24. ¹¹⁰ Codd. A C D E addunt nobis.¹²⁰ Cap. 17. n. 31.¹³⁰ Loc. cit. et cap. 18. n. 32. ⁰⁰⁰ Locus Scripturae est Rom. 5, 5.¹⁴⁰ Edd. 1, 8 ante solum addunt Hoc, ed. 2 legit:⁰ Solum enim est.¹⁵⁰ Codd. A B C E bene praemittunt ille, sed contra originale et edd.¹⁶⁰ I. Cor. 13, 1, in cuius textus fine Vat. et aliae edd. contra codd. et Vulgatam legunt non pro nihil.¹⁷⁰ Vat. et aliae edd. contra codd. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 7 addunt est.¹⁸⁰ Hic, cap. 1. et 2.##¹⁹⁰ Chapter 19, n. 37.^{0 00} The next passage from (St.) Augustine is loc. cit., ch. 17, n. 31; but its beginning has been contracted by Master (Peter), who has, besides, changed many words.²⁰ 1 Jn. 4:7-8.^{0 00} Only the Vatican edition reads:⁰ And in the same [Et in eodem] for a little after this [paulo post], and conversely has below a little after this [paulo post] in place of in the same [in eodem].³⁰ Chapter 17, n. 31.^{0 00} In this phrase codices A B and C after the same [eodem] add (St.) Augustine (says) [Augustinus]. ⁰⁰⁰ The passage from Scripture is loc. cit., verse 13.⁰ The Vulgate reads:⁰ In this we cognize, that we remain in Him and He in us:⁰ since He has given us of His Spirit [In hoc cognoscimus, quoniam in eo manemus et ipse in nobis:⁰ quoniam de Spiritu suo dedit nobis].⁰ Codices A B C and E and edition 5 read we have cognized [cognovimus].⁴⁰ Supply with edition 1:⁰ the Spirit [Spiritus].^{0 00} In the previous sentence the Vatican edition, together with not a few editions read Therefore [igitur] for Therefore [ergo].⁰ Then after From these [Ex his] the Vatican edition and editions 3, 5, 8 and 9 insert therefore [ergo].⁵⁰ Only the Vatican edition omits and [et].⁰ A little after this editions 5 and 8 have from Him [ex eo] in place of from God [ex Deo].⁶⁰ Chapter 17, n. 27.⁰ Next only the Vatican edition and edition 6, together with codex C, omit thus [ita].^{0 0} Then in the very text of (St.) Augustine after We are not going to say [dictari sumus] editions 1 and 8 add as certain ones say [ut quidam dicunt].⁷⁰ Ps. 70:5.^{0 00} Here the Vatican edition and editions 5, 8 and 9, together with codex E, read of God [de Deo] for to God [Deo].^{0 00} A little below this after has it been said [dictum est], the Vatican edition together with the other editions repeats Thou art my patience [Tu es patientia mea], breaking with the codices, with edition 1 and with the original.⁸⁰ Ps. 61:6.^{0 00} Next only editions 1 and 8 read:⁰ immediately refute [statim refellit] for easily refute [facile refellit].⁹⁰ Ps. 90:9; and the following text is Ps. 58:18.¹⁰⁰ 1 Jn. 4:16, and then, J. 4:24.¹¹⁰ Codices A C D and E add to us [nobis].¹²⁰ Chapter 17, n. 31.¹³⁰ Loc. cit. and chapter 18, n. 32.^{0 00} The passage from Scripture is Romans 5:5.¹⁴⁰ Editions 1 and 8 read This alone is [Hoc solum est], edition 2 reads For it alone is [Solum enim est].¹⁵⁰ Codices A B C and E give a word for subject of the Latin verb, he [ille], but contrary to the original and the editions.¹⁶⁰ 1 Cor. 13:1, at the end of which text the Vatican edition and the other editions, contrary to the codices and the Vulgate, read not [non] for nothing [nihil].¹⁷⁰ The Vatican edition and the other editions, contrary to the codices and to editions 1, 2, 3 and 7, add is [est].¹⁸⁰ Here in chapters 1 and 2.###p. 289caritas sit Spiritus sanctus et donum excellentius, et quomodo hoc doonum, id est Spiritus sanctus, detur nobis, scilicet cum ita impertitur alicui, id est, ita habet esse in aliquo, ut eum faciat Dei et proximi amatorem.⁰ Quod cum facit, tunc dari dicitur sive mitti alicui, et tunc ille dicitur proprie habere Spiritum sanctum.#charity is the

Holy Spirit and a more excellent gift, and in what manner this gift, that is, the Holy Spirit, is given to us, that is, when He is thus imparted to anyone, that is, thus has ¹being² in anyone, that He makes him a lover of God and neighbor.³ Which, when He does, He is then said to be given or sent to someone [alicui], and then he is said to properly have the Holy Spirit.##PARS. II.#PART II##Cap. V.⁴Utrum Spiritus sanctus augeatur in homine vel minus et magis habeatur vel detur, et an detur habenti et non habenti.#Chapter V⁵Whether the Holy Spirit is increased in a man, and/or is less and more had and/or given, and whether He is given to one having and to one not having.##Hic quaeritur, si caritas Spiritus sanctus est, cum ipsa augeatur et minuatur in homine et magis et minus per diversa tempora habeatur, utrum concedendum sit, quod Spiritus sanctus augeatur vel minuatur in homine et magis vel minus habeatur.⁶ Si enim in homine augetur et magis vel minus datur et habetur, mutabilis esse videtur; Deus autem omnino immutabilis est.⁷ Videtur ergo, quod vel Spiritus sanctus non sit caritas, vel caritas non augeatur vel minuatur in homine.⁸ Item, caritas et non habenti datur, ut habeat, et habenti, ut plenius habeat.⁹ Si ergo Spiritus sanctus caritas est, et non habenti datur, ut habeat, et habenti, ut plenius habeat.¹⁰ Sed quomodo datur non habenti, cum ipse ut Deus sit ubique et in omnibus creaturis totus? et quomodo plenius datur vel habetur sine sui mutatione?#Here there is asked, ¹¹if charity is the Holy Spirit, since it is increased [augeatur] and decreased [minuatur] in a man and is had more and less through diverse seasons, whether it must be conceded, that the Holy Spirit is increased and/or decreased in a man and had more and/or less?¹² For if He is increased in a man, and given and had more and/or less, He seems to be mutable; but God is entirely immutable.¹³ Therefore it seems, that either the Holy Spirit is not charity, and/or charity is not increased and/or decreased in a man.¹⁴ Likewise, (that) charity is not given to one not having, so that he have it, and to one having, that he have it more fully.¹⁵ Therefore, if the Holy Spirit is charity, He is both given to one not having, that he have, and to one having, that he have more fully.¹⁶ But in what manner is He given to one not having, since He Himself as God is everywhere and whole in all creatures? and in what manner is He given and/or had more fully without being changed on His own [sine sui mutatione]?##His ita¹⁷ respondemus dicentes, quod Spiritus sanctus sive caritas penitus immutabilis est nec in se augetur vel minuitur nec in se recipit magis vel minus, sed in homine vel potius homini augetur et minuitur et magis vel minus datur vel habetur; sicut Deus dicitur magnificari et exaltari in nobis, qui tamen in se nec magnificatur nec exaltatur.¹⁸ Unde Propheta:¹⁹ Accedet homo ad cor altum, et exaltabitur Deus.²⁰ Super quem locum ait auctoritas:²¹ Deus non in se, sed in corde hominis grandescit ²².²³ Sic ergo Spiritus sanctus homini datur et datus amplius datur, id est augetur, et magis ac minus habetur, et tamen immutabilis existit.#To these we respond thus,²⁴ saying, that the Holy Spirit or Charity is thoroughly [penitus] immutable and is not increased and/or decreased in Himself, nor receives more and/or less in Himself, but in a man and/or rather for a man is increased and decreased and given and/or had more and/or less; just as God is said to be magnified and exalted in us, Who nevertheless is neither magnified nor exalted in Himself.²⁵ Whence the Prophet (says):²⁶ A man will approach according to a high heart [ad cor altum], and God shall be exalted.²⁷ On which passage the authority (of Cassiodorus) says:²⁸ God not in Himself, but in the heart of a man becomes great [grandescit] ²⁹.³⁰ In this manner, therefore, the Holy Spirit is given to a man and as One given is given more fully, that is, is increased, and is had more and less, and yet exists as One immutable.##Cumque ubique sit et in omni creatura totus, sunt tamen multi, qui eum non habent.³¹ Non enim omnes Spiritus sanctum habent, in quibus est; alioquin et irrationales creaturae haberent Spiritum sanctum, quod fidei pietas non admittit.#And since He is everywhere and in every creature whole, yet there are many, who do not have Him.³² For not all, in whom He is, have the Holy Spirit; otherwise even irrational creatures would have the Holy Spirit, which (proposition) the piety of the faith does not admit.##Ut autem certius fiat quod diximus, auctoritate confirmamus.³³ Quod Spiritus sanctus magis ac minus percipiatur et homini augeatur et non habenti detur, et habenti, ut plus habeatur, Augustinus ostendit super Ioannem³⁴ dicens:³⁵ Sine Spiritu sancto constat Christum nos non diligere

et eius mandata servare non posse, et id nos posse atque agere tanto minus, quanto illum percipimus minus, tanto vero amplius, quanto illum percipimus amplius. ¶ Ideoque non solum non habenti, verum etiam habenti non incassum promittitur: ¶ non habenti quidem, ut habeatur, habenti autem, ut amplius habeatur. ¶ Nam si ab alio minus et ab alio amplius non haberetur, sanctus Eliseus sancto Eliae non diceret:8 ¶ Spiritus, qui est in te, duplo sit in me. ¶ Christo autem, qui est Dei Filius, non ad mensuram datus est Spiritus.9 ¶ Neque enim sine gratia Spiritus sancti, est Mediator Dei et hominum homo Christus;10 quod enim est unigenitus Filius aequalis Patri, non est gratiae, sed naturae; quod autem in unitatem personae Unigenti assumptus est homo, gratiae est, non naturae. ¶ Ceteris autem ad mensuram datur et datus additur, donec unicuique pro modo suae perfectionis propria mensura compleatur ¶. ¶ Ecce expressum11 habes, quod Spiritus sanctus magis et minus datur vel accipitur, et homini datus augetur, et habenti et non habenti datur, quia Spiritus sanctus est caritas, quae non habenti datur et in habente augetur et proficit. ¶ Immo, ut verius et magis proprie loquar, homo in ea proficit et deficit aliquando; et tunc ipsa dicitur proficere vel deficere, quae tamen nec proficit nec deficit in se, quia Deus est. ¶ Unde Augustinus in homilia nona super Epistolam Ioannis12 ait: ¶ ¶ Probet se quisque, quantum in illo profecerit caritas, vel potius quantum ipse in caritate profecerit. ¶ Nam si caritas Deus est, nec proficit nec deficit. ¶ Sic ergo dicitur proficere in te caritas, quia tu in ea proficis ¶. ¶ Ecce quomodo intelligendum sit, cum dicitur Spiritus sanctus augeri in nobis, quia nos in eo scilicet proficimus; sic et alia huiusmodi.¶Moreover, so that what we have said, be made more certain, we confirm it with authority.6 ¶ That the Holy Spirit is perceived more and less and is increased in a man and given to one not having (Him), and to one having (Him), so that He be had more, (St.) Augustine shows On (the Gospel of St.) John7 saying: ¶ ¶ Without the Holy Spirit it is established that we do not love Christ and cannot observe His commandments [mandata], and that we can and do act so much the less, as we perceive Him less, but so much more fully, when we perceive Him more fully. ¶ And for that reason not only to the one not having (Him), but also to the one having (Him) is He not in vain [incassum] promised: ¶ to the one not having indeed, that He might be had, but to the one having, that He be had more fully. ¶ For if He were not had less by one and more fully by another, Saint Eliseus would not have said to Saint Elias:8 ¶ May the Spirit, which is in thee, be double in me. ¶ Moreover to Christ, who is the Son of God, the Spirit has not been given according to a measure.9 ¶ For neither without the grace of the Holy Spirit, is the Mediator of God and men the Man Christ,10 for because the Only-Begotten Son is equal to the Father, He is not (a son) of grace, but (a Son) of Nature; but because the Man has been assumed into the unity of the Person of the Only-Begotten, He is (a son) of grace, not (a Son) of Nature. ¶ But to all others (the Holy Spirit) is given according measure and as One given is added, while to each one in virtue of the manner of his own perfection He is completed by the proper measure ¶. ¶ Behold you have an express (argument),11 that the Holy Spirit is given and/or accepted more and less, and as One given to a man is increased, and is given to the one having and not having (Him), because the Holy Spirit is the Charity, which is given to the one not having and is increased and progresses [proficit] in the one having. ¶ Nay, to speak more truly and more properly, a man progresses and fails in it sometimes; and then it is said to progress and/or fail, which yet does not progress nor fail in itself, because it is God. ¶ Whence (St.) Augustine in his ninth homily On the Letter of (St.) John12 says: ¶ ¶ Let everyman prove himself, how much charity has progressed in him, and/or rather how much he has progressed in charity. ¶ For if charity is God, it neither progresses nor fails. ¶ Therefore charity is thus said to progress in you, because you progress in it ¶. ¶ Behold in what manner it must be understood, when the Holy Spirit is said to be increased in us, that we, namely, progress in Him; so also the other things of this kind.###10 Vat. et ed. 4 vel magis et minus; edd. 2, 3, 5, 7, 9 cum cod. D et magis et minus; ed. 8 id est magis vel. ¶ Secuti sumus codd. A B C E et edd. 1, 6.2 ¶ Respicitur ad Luc. 19, 26.3 ¶ Vat. et aliae edd. contra ed. 1 et omnes codd. itaque.4 ¶ Psalm. 63, 7. 8. ¶ ¶ Vat. et nonnullae edd. Accedit, contradicente etiam Vulgata.5 ¶ Scilicet Cassiodorus supra Psalm. 63, 6. ¶ ¶ Paulo post Vat. cum aliis edd. magis et minus, sed codd. magis ac minus.6 ¶ Vat.

et edd. 4, 6 confirmemus; edd. 1, 8 firmemus. Mox solummodo Vat. et edd. 4 post detur adiiciunt ut habeatur. Denique edd. 1, 8 post ut plus addunt vel plenius. 7 Tract. 74. in Evang. Ioan. n. 2. et 3.8 IV. Reg. 2, 9. Vulgata: Obsecro, ut fiat in me duplex spiritus tuus. Magister refert haec verba, sicut habentur apud Augustinum. Post hunc locum omnes codd. et edd. 1, 6 addunt vel in margine vel in textu sequentem notulam, quae etiam a S. Thoma in suo Comment. (hic, expositio textus) citatur: In libro Regum legitur sic: Elias dixit ad Eliseum: Postula quod vis, et faciam tibi, antequam tollar a te: dixitque Eliseus: Obsecro, ut spiritus tuus fiat duplex in me. Quod ibidem sic exponitur: Elias spiritu prophetali et operatione miraculorum excellenter pollebat. Geminam ergo gratiam, quam Eliseus in Magistro vigere cognoscebat, sibi tribui rogavit. Unde patet, quod non esse discipulus super Magistrum postulavit.9 Ioan. 3, 41. Vulgata: non enim ad mensuram dat Deus spiritum.10 I. Tim.

2, 5. Mox Vat. et plures edd. post unigenitus addunt Dei, contradicentibus omnibus codd., et edd. 1, 8 et Augustino, qui etiam vocem Filius omittit.11 Vat. et plures edd. expresse contra codd. et edd. 1, 8.12 Sive Tract. 9. in Epist. Ioan. n. 2.##10 The Vatican edition and edition 4 read and/or more and less [vel magis et minus]; editions 2, 3, 5, 7 and 9, together with codex D have and more and less [et magis et minus]; edition 8 that is more and/or [id est magis vel]. We have followed codices A B C and E, and editions 1 and 6.20 A reference to Lk. 19:26.30 The Vatican edition and the other editions, contrary to all the codices, have And thus to these we etc. [His itaque].40 Ps. 63:7,8.00 The Vatican edition and not a few editions read A man approaches [Accedit homo], contradicting even the Vulgate.50 That is, (the senator Flavius Magnus Aurelius) Cassiodorus [c. A.D. 490- c. 583], on Psalm 63:6.00 A little after this the Vatican edition together with the other editions has more and less [magis et minus], but the codices have more and less [magis ac minus].60 The Vatican edition and editions 4 and 6 read let us confirm it [confirmemus]; editions 1 and 8 have let us make it firm [firmemus]. Next only the Vatican edition and edition 4 after is given to one not having (Him) [non habenti detur] add that He may be had [ut habeatur]. Then editions 1 and 8 after be had more [plus] insert and/or more fully [vel plenius].70 On the Gospel of (St.) John, Tract 74, nn. 2 and 3.80 4 Kings 2:9. The Vulgate reads: I beseech, that thy spirit might become double in me [Obsecro, ut fiat in me duplex spiritus tuus]. Master (Peter) reports these words, as they are had in (St.) Augustine's text. After this quote all the codices and editions 1 and 6 add either in the margin or in the following text a note, which is even cited by St. Thomas in his own Commentary (here in the exposition of the text): In the Book of Kings there is thus read: Elias said to Eliseus: Ask what you will, and I shall do it for you, before I am taken from you: and Eliseus said: I beseech, that thy spirit be made double in me. Which same is thus expounded: Elias was powerful in the spirit of prophecy and in the working of miracles in an excellent manner. Therefore Eliseus asked to be granted him, the twin grace, which he recognized to be strong in his Master. Whence it is clear, that the disciple did not ask to be above (his) Master.90 Jn 3:41. The Vulgate reads: for not according to a measure does God give the spirit [non enim ad mensuram dat Deus spiritum].100 1 Tim. 2:5.00 Next the Vatican edition and very many editions after Only-Begotten Son [unigenitus] add of God [Dei], with all the codices contradicting and editions 1 and 8 and (St.) Augustine contradicting this, which latter even omits the word Son [Filius].110 The Vatican edition and very many editions read expressly [expresse] for an express (argument) [expressum], contrary to the codices and editions 1 and 8.120 Or On the Gospel of St. John, Tract 9, n. 2.### p. 290Cap. VI. Quod aliqui dicunt, caritatem Dei et proximi non esse Spiritum sanctum. Chapter VI That some say, that the charity of God and neighbor is not the Holy Spirit.##Supra dictum est, quod Spiritus sanctus est caritas Patris et Filii, qua se invicem diligunt et nos, et ipse idem est caritas, quae diffunditur in cordibus nostris ad diligendum Deum et proximum. Horum alterum omnes catholici concedunt, scilicet quod Spiritus sanctus sit caritas Patris et Filii, quod autem ipse idem sit caritas, qua diligimus Deum et proximum, a plerisque negatur. Dicunt enim: si Spiritus sanctus caritas est Patris et Filii et nostra, eadem ergo caritas est, qua Deus diligit nos, et qua nos

diligimus eum. ¶Hoc autem Sanctorum auctoritates negare videntur.¶ Dicit enim Augustinus in libro de Spiritu et littera:1¶ Unde est dilectio, nisi unde et ipsa fides, id est a Spiritu sancto? ¶Non enim esset in nobis, nisi diffunderetur in cordibus nostris per Spiritum. ¶Caritas autem Dei dicta est diffundi in cordibus nostris, non qua nos ipse diligit, sed qua nos facit dilectores suos. ¶Sicut iustitia Dei dicitur, qua nos iusti eius munere efficimur, et Domini salus, qua nos salvat, et fides Christis, qua nos fideles facit ¶. ¶His verbis videtur monstrari distinctio inter caritatem, qua Deus nos diligit, et qua nos diligimus. ¶Et sicut iustitia nostra dicitur Dei, non quod ipse sit ea iustus, sed quia ea nos iustos facit, similiter et fides et salus; sic videtur dicta caritas Dei, quae est in nobis, non quod ipse ea diligit, sed quia ea nos diligere facit. ¶De hoc etiam idem Augustinus in libro decimo quinto de Trinitate2 ait:¶ Cum Ioannes commemorasset Dei dilectionem, non qua nos eum, sed qua ipse dilexit nos, et misit Filium suum liberatorem pro peccatis nostris ¶. ¶Ecce et hic videtur manifeste dividere dilectionem, qua nos diligimus Deum, ab ea, qua ipse diligit nos. ¶Si ergo, inquiunt, Spiritus sanctus dilectio est, qua Deus diligit, et qua nos diligimus, duplex dilectio est, immo duo diversa est, quod absurdum et a veritate longe est. ¶Non est ergo dilectio, qua diligimus, sed qua Deus tantum diligit nos.¶Above it has been said, that the Holy Spirit is the Father's and Son's charity, by which They love one Another and us, and the very Same is the Charity, which is poured forth in our hearts to love God and neighbor.¶ The former of the two of these [Horum alterum] all Catholics concede, that is, that the Holy Spirit is the Father's and the Son's Charity, but that the very Same is the Charity, by which we love God and neighbor, is denied by very many. ¶For they say:¶ if the Holy Spirit is the Father's and the Son's Charity and our own, therefore the same Charity is, That by which God loves us, and That by which we love Him.¶ But this the authorities of the Saints seem to deny. ¶For (St.) Augustine says in the book On the Spirit and the Letter:1¶ Whence is love, except whence faith itself is, that is from the Holy Spirit?¶ For it would not be in us, unless it were poured forth in our hearts through the Holy Spirit.¶ But the charity said to be poured forth in our hearts is not, that by which He loves us, but that by which He makes us lovers of Him [dilectores suos]. ¶Just as God's justice is said (to be), that by which we are made just by His gift [munere], and the Lord's salvation, that by which He saves us, and the faith of Christ, that by which He makes us faithful ¶. ¶With these words there seems to be shown a distinction between the charity, by which God loves us, and by which we love.¶ And just our are justice is said (to be) of God [Dei], not because He Himself is just by that, but because by that He makes us just, similarly also faith and salvation; so the charity seems said (to be) God's, which is in us, not because He loves by that, but because He makes us love by that. ¶Of this even (St.) Augustine in the fifteenth book On the Trinity2 says the same:¶ Though (St.) John commemorated the Love of God, (it was) not that by which we (love) Him, but (rather) that by which He Himself loved us, and sent His own Son as Liberator for our sins ¶.¶ Behold here too it seems that he manifestly divides the love, by which we love God, from that, by which He Himself loves us. ¶If, therefore, they say, love is the Holy Spirit, by which God loves, and that by which we love, there is a twofold love, nay the two are diverse [duo diversa est], which is absurd and far from the truth. ¶He is not, therefore, the love, by which we love, but That by which God only loves us.¶His respondemus praedictarum auctoritatum verba determinantes hoc modo:¶ caritas Dei dicta est diffundi in cordibus nostris, non qua ipse nos diligit, sed qua nos diligere facit etc. ¶His verbis non dividitur nec diversa3 ostenditur caritas, qua Deus nos diligit, ab ea, qua nos diligimus, sed potius, cum sit una et eadem caritas et dicatur ipse Dei caritas, diversis de causis et rationibus Dei caritas appellari in Scriptura ostenditur. ¶Dicitur enim Dei caritas, vel quia Deus ea diligit nos, vel quia nos ea sui dilectores facit.¶To these we respond, determining the words of the aforesaid authorities in this manner:¶ the charity of God said to be poured forth in our hearts is not that by which He loves us, but that by which He makes us love etc.¶. ¶By these words there is not divided nor is there shown (to be) diverse3 the Charity, by which God loves us, from That, by which we love, but rather, since there is one and the same Charity and It is said (to be) the very Charity of

God, It is shown in Scripture to be named the Charity of God from diverse causes and reckonings. For it is said (to be) the Charity of God, either because God loves us by It, and/or because He makes us lovers of Him by It.##Cum ergo ab Apostolo dicitur caritas Dei diffundi in cordibus nostris, non est dicta caritas Dei, qua diligit nos, sed qua facit nos diligere, id est, non ibi appellatur caritas Dei, eo quod Deus ea nos diligit, sed eo quod nos ea sui dilectores facit. Et quod ea ratione possit dici caritas Dei, quia nos ea diligere facit, ex simili genere locutionis ostendit;4 sicut dicitur iustitia Dei, qua nos iustificat, et Domini salus, qua nos salvat, et fides Christi, qua nos fideles facit.##When, therefore, there is said by the Apostle the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts, there is not said the Charity of God, by which He loves us, but by which He makes us love, that is, it is named there the charity of God not for the reason, that God loves us by it, but for the reason that He makes us lovers of Him by it. And that for this reason it can be said (to be) the Charity of God, because He makes us love by it, he shows4 from a similar kind [genus] of saying; just as there is said the justice of God, by which He justifies us, and the Lord's salvation,

by which He saves us, and the faith of Christ, by which He makes us faithful.##Similiter et aliam exponimus auctoritatem, ubi ait, dilectionem Dei commemorari, non qua nos eum, sed qua ipse dilexit nos, ac si diceret, commemorat dilectionem Dei, non secundum quod ea nos diligimus Deum, sed secundum quod ipse ea diligit nos.##We also similarly expound the other authority, where he says, that the love of God is commemorated, not that by which we (love) Him, but that by which He loved us, as if he said, he commemorates the Love of God, not according to which we love God by It, but according to which He loves us by It.##Sed aliud est, inquiunt, quod magis urget. Dixit enim supra5 Augustinus, quod dilectio est a Spiritu sancto, a quo et fides. Sicut ergo fides non est Spiritus sanctus, a quo est, ita nec caritas. Quomodo enim caritas6 Spiritus sanctus est, si ab ipso est? Nam si ab ipso est et ipse est, ergo Spiritus sanctus a se ipso est. Ad quod dicimus: Spiritus sanctus quidem a se ipso non est, sed tamen a se ipso datur nobis, ut supra dictum est.7 Dat enim se ipsum nobis Spiritus sanctus. Et ex hoc sensu dictum est, quod caritas ab ipso est in nobis, et tamen ipsa Spiritus sanctus est. Fides autem est a Spiritu sancto, et non est Spiritus sanctus, quia donum vel datum solummodo est, non Deus dans.##But there is something else, they say, which urges more. For above5 (St.) Augusti ne said, that love is from the Holy Spirit, from whom (is) also faith. Therefore just as faith is not the Holy Spirit, from whom it is, so neither charity. For in what manner is charity6 the Holy Spirit, if it is from Him? For if it is from Him and is Him, therefore the Holy Spirit is from Himself. To which we say: the Holy Spirit is indeed not from Himself, but yet is given to us from Himself, as has been said.7 For the Holy Spirit gives His very Self to us. And from this sense there has been said, that the Charity from Him is in us, and yet It Itself is the Holy Spirit. Moreover, faith is from the Holy Spirit, and is not the Holy Spirit, because He is only the gift and/or given, not the God giving.##Alias quoque inducunt rationes ad idem ostendendum, scilicet quod caritas non sit Spiritus sanctus, quia caritas affectio mentis est et motus animi; Spiritus sanctus vero non est affectio animi vel motus mentis, quia Spiritus sanctus immutabilis est et8 increatus: non est ergo caritas.##They also bring in other reasons to show the same, that is, that charity is not the Holy Spirit, because charity is an affection of mind and a movement of the spirit [animi]; but the Holy Spirit is not an affection of the spirit and/or a movement of the mind, because the Holy Spirit is immutable and8 uncreated: therefore He is not charity.##Quod autem caritas sit affectio animi et motus mentis, auctoritatibus confirmant. Dicit enim Augustinus in tertio libro de Doctrina christiana:9 Caritatem voco motum animi ad fruendum Deo propter ipsum et se ac proximo propter Deum. Idem in libro de Moribus Ecclesiae catholicae,10 tractans illud verbum Apostoli: Nec mors nec vita poterit nos separare a caritate Dei: Caritas Dei, inquit, hic dicta est virtus, quae animi nostri rectissima affectio est, quae coniungit nos Deo, qua eum diligimus. Ecce his verbis exprimitur, quod caritas est affectio et motus animi, ac per hoc non videtur esse Spiritus sanctus.##Moreover, that charity is an affection of the spirit and a movement of the mind, they confirm

by authorities. ¶ For (St.) Augustine in the third book On Christian Doctrine⁹ (says): ¶ I call ¶ charity ¶ a movement of the spirit to enjoy God for His own sake and (to enjoy) oneself and neighbor for God's sake ¶. ¶ Likewise in the book On the Customs of the Catholic Church,¹⁰ treating of that verse of the Apostle: ¶ Neither death nor life will be able to separate us from the charity of God, says: ¶ The charity of God is here said (to be) the virtue, which is the most upright affection of our spirit, which conjoins us to God, by which we love Him ¶. ¶ Behold with these words there is expressed, that charity is an affection and movement of the spirit, and through this it does not seem to be the Holy Spirit. ## Ad quod dicimus, hoc ita dictum esse, sicut dicitur: ¶ Deus est spes nostra, et patientia nostra, quia . . . ¶ To which we say, that this has been said thus, jus as there is said: ¶ God is our hope, and our patience, because . . . ## 10 Cap. 32. n. 56; in principio textus Magister verba mutavit. ¶ Sic enim legitur apud Augustinum: ¶ Unde ergo ista dilectio, id est caritas, per quam fides operatur, nisi unde illam fides ipsa impetravit? ¶ Neque enim etc. ¶ ¶ Locus Sc#r#i#p#t#u#r#a#e#,# #a#d# #q#u#e#m# #a#l#l#u#d#i#t#u#r#,# #e#s#t# #R#o#m#.# #5#,# #5#.#2# ¶ C#a#p#.# #1#7#.# #n#.# #3#1#.# ¶ A#l#l#u#d#i#t#u#r# #a#d# #I#.# #I#o#a#n#.# #4#,# #1#0#,# #u#b#i# #M#a#g#i#s#t#e#r# #m#a#l#e# #h#a#b#e#t# #l#i#b#e#r#a#t#o#r#e#m#.# ¶ V#u#l#g#a#t#a#:# ¶ #p#r#o#p#i#t#i#a#t#i#o#n#e#m#;# #e#d#d#.# #1#,# #8# #c#u#m# #t#e#x#t#u# #A#u#g#u#s#t#i#n#i# #l#i#t#a#t#o#r#e#m# #(#G#r#a#c#e#:# #i#l#a#s#m#o#n#)##3# ¶ E#d#d#.# #2#,# #3#,# #5#,# #7# #d#i#v#i#s#a#.# ¶ P#a#u#l#o# #p#o#s#t# #V#at. cum aliis edd., exceptis 1, 8, contra codd. particulam et praemittit verbo diversis, sed minus bene. ¶ Deinique Vat. et edd. 4, 8 legunt suos dilectores loco sui dilectores.⁴ ¶ Vat. et edd. 1, 4, 6, 8 cum cod. D ostenditur.⁵ ¶ In principio huiuscap.⁶ ¶ Vat. et aliae edd., exceptis 1, 8, omittunt caritas contra codd.; immediate ante Vat. cum cod. D et plerisque edd. legit ergo pro enim.⁷ ¶ Dist. XV.⁸ ¶ Sola Vat. omittit et.⁹ ¶ Cap. 10. n. 16.¹⁰ ¶ Libr. I. c. 11. n. 19. ¶ ¶ Locus Apostoli est Rom. 8, 38. 39. ¶ ¶ In principio textus Augustinis post inquit Vat. sola addit in sensu; etiam vocabulum sequens hic omittitur ab edd. 2, 3, 5, 7, 9. ## 10 Chapter 32, n. 56; at the beginning of the text Master (Peter) has changed the words. ¶ For it reads in this manner in (St.) Augustine: ¶ Whence, therefore, that love of His, that is, the charity, through which faith works, except whence faith itself obtains it by asking? ¶ For it would neither etc. [Unde ergo ista dilectio, id est caritas, per quam fides operatur, nisi unde illam fides ipsa impetravit? ¶ Neque enim etc.]. ¶ ¶ The text of Scripture to which it alludes is Romans 5:5.² ¶ Chapter 17, n. 31. ¶ The allusion is to 1 Jn. 4:10, in which Master (Peter) has badly Liberator [liberatore]. ¶ The Vulgate reads: ¶ the propitiation [propitiationem]; editions 1 and 8, together with the text of (St.) Augustine have the One bringing an acceptable offering [litatore], in Greek ##### ¶ i#l#a#s#m#o#n#.#3# ¶ E#d#d#i#t#i#o#n#s# #2#,# #3#,# #5# #a#n#d# #7#,# #h#a#v#e# #d#i#v#i#d#e#d# #[#d#i#v#i#s#a#]#.# ¶ A# #l#i#t#t#l#e# #a#f#t#e#r# #t#h#i#s# #t#h#e# #V#a#t#i#c#a#n# #e#d#i#t#i#o#n#,# #t#o#g#e#t#h#e#r# #w#i#t#h# #t#h#e# #o#t#h#e#r# #e#d#i#t#i#o#n#s#,# #e#x#c#e#p#t# #1# #a#n#d# #8#,# #c#o#n#t#r#a#r#y# #t#o# #t#h#e# #c#o#d#i#c#e#s#,# #p#r#e#f#a#c#e#s# #t#o# #t#h#e# #w#o#r#d# #d#i#v#e#r#s#e# #[#d#i#v#e#r#s#i#s#]# #t#h#e# #p#a#r#t#i#c#l#e# #b#o#t#h# #[#e#t#]#,# #b#u#t# #l#e#s#s# #w#e#l#l#.# ¶ ¶ Then the Vatican edition and editions 4 and 8, read His lovers [suos dilectores] in place of lovers of Him [sui dilectores].⁴ ¶ The Vatican edition and editions 1, 4, 6 and 8, together with codex D, have is shown [ostenditur].⁵ ¶ At the beginning of this chapter.⁶ ¶ The Vatican edition and the other editions, except 1 and 8, by omitting charity [caritas] read it, contrary to the codices; immediately before this the Vatican edition, together with codex D and very many editions, reads Therefore [ergo] for For [enim].⁷ ¶ Distinction XV.⁸ ¶ Only the Vatican edition omits and [et].⁹ ¶ Chapter 10, n. 16.¹⁰ ¶ Book I, ch. 11, n. 19. ¶ ¶ The passage taken from the Apostle is Romans 8:38-39. ¶ ¶ At the beginning of the text of (St.) Augustine after The Charity of God [Caritas Dei inquit] adds in its sense [in sensu]; and editions 2, 3, 5, 7, and 9 also omit the following word here [hic]. ## ¶ Op. 291 facit nos sperare et pati; ita caritas dicitur esse motus sive affectio animi, quia per eam movetur et afficitur animus ad diligendum Deum. ¶ Non autem mireris, si caritas, cum sit

Spiritus sanctus, dicatur motus mentis, cum etiam in libro Sapientiae dicatur de Spiritu Sapientiae, quae attingit a fine usque ad finem, quod est actus mobilis, certus, incoinquinatus. Quod non ideo dicitur, quod Sapientia sit mobile aliquid vel actus aliquis, sed quia sui immobilitate omnia attingit non locali motu, sed ut ubique semper sit et nusquam inclusa teneatur. Sic ergo caritas dicitur motus animi, non quod ipsa sit motus vel affectio vel virtus animi, sed quia per eam, quasi esset virtus, afficitur mens et movetur. Sed si caritas Spiritus sanctus est, qui operatur in singulis, prout vult, cum per eum mens hominis afficiatur et moveatur ad credendum vel sperandum et huiusmodi, sicut ad diligendum; quare non sic dicitur caritas motus vel affectio mentis ad credendum vel sperandum, sicut ad diligendum? Ad quod sane dici potest, quia alios actus atque motus virtutum operatur caritas, id est Spiritus sanctus, mediantibus virtutibus, quarum actus sunt, ut pote actum fidei, id est credere fide media, et actum spei, id est sperare media spe. Per fidem enim et spem praedictos operatur actus. Diligendi vero actum per se tantum sine alicuius virtutis medio operatur, id est diligere. Aliter ergo hunc actum operatur quam alios virtutum actus. Ideoque differenter de hoc et de aliis loquitur Scriptura, quae istum specialiter caritati tribuit. Est ergo caritas vere Spiritus sanctus. Unde Augustinus, praemissum verbum Apostolic tractans, in eodem libro caritatem dicit esse bonum, quo nil melius est, et per hoc ipsam esse Deum significat dicens: Si nulla res

ab eius caritate nos separat, quid esse non solum melius, sed etiam certius hoc bono potest. Ecce dicit, quia caritate nihil est melius. Caritas ergo Spiritus sanctus est, qui Deus est et donum Dei sive datum, qui dividit singulis fidelibus dona nec ipse dividitur, sed indivisus singulis datur. Unde Augustinus, ubi Ioannis dicit, non ad mensuram Christo dari Spiritum, ait: Ceteris vero dividitur, non quidem ipse Spiritus, sed dona eius. He makes us hope and be patient [pati]; thus Charity is said to be a movement or affection of the spirit, because through it the spirit is moved and affected to love God. Moreover do not wonder, if Charity, since it is the Holy Spirit, is said to be a movement of the mind, since even in the Book of Wisdom there is said of the Spirit of Wisdom, which attains from end even to end, because He is an Act mobile, certain, undefiled. Which is not, for that reason, said, because Wisdom is something mobile and/or some act, but because He attains by His immobility all (things), not by local movement, but as One (who) is always everywhere and is never held enclosed. Therefore in this manner Charity is said to be a movement of the spirit, not because It Itself is a movement and/or affection and/or virtue of the spirit, but because through It, as if It were a virtue, the mind is affected and moved. But if Charity is the Holy Spirit, who works in each, as He wills, since through Him the mind of a man is affected and moved to believe and/or hope and (to other acts) of this kind, just as to love; for what reason is Charity in this manner not said (to be) a movement and/or affection of the mind to believe and/or hope, just as (it is) to love? To which there can sanely be said, that Charity works the other acts and movements of the virtues, that is, the Holy Spirit (works), by means of the virtues, the acts of which they are, as for example the act of faith, that is, to believe by means of the faith, and the act of hope, that is, to hope by means of hope. For through faith and hope He works the aforesaid acts. However the act of loving, that is to love, He works through Himself without the means of any virtue. Therefore He works this act in a manner other than the other acts of the virtues. And for that reason Scripture, which grants this especially to Charity, speaks differently of this and of the others. Therefore Charity is truly the Holy Spirit. Whence (St.) Augustine, treating of the aforesaid verse, says in the same book that Charity is a good, than which nothing is better, and through this he signifies that It is God, saying: If no thing separates us from His Charity, what can be not only better, but even more certain that this Good? Behold he says, that nothing is better than Charity. Therefore, Charity is the Holy Spirit, who is God and the gift or given of God, who is divides gifts to each of the faithful and is not Himself divided, but is given to each undivided. Whence (St.) Augustine, where (St.) John says, not according to measure is the Spirit given to Christ, says: However, to all the others there is divided, not indeed the Holy Spirit, but His gifts. 10 Cap. 8. 1; et

verba, quae sequuntur, c. 7. 22, ubi Vulgata, inverso ordine verborum: ① mobilis, inconinquinatus, certus. ② Vat. cum aliis edd., exceptis 1, 8 et cod. D, ante attingit legit qui loco quae, et deinde codd. A C D et edd. 1, 8 male iterum legunt qui pro quod. 2② Sola Vat. omittit et. 3② I. Cor. 12, 11. 4② De Moribus Eccl. I. chap. 11. n. 18. ③③ Mox codd. A B C E et edd. 1, 5 omittunt ④ est post nil melius. 5② Tract. 74. in Evang. Ioan. n. 3. ⑥ Ad Ioan. 3, 34. ⑦ Augustini verba sunt: ⑧ Neque enim ipse dividitur Spiritus, sed dona per Spiritum: ⑨ nam divisiones donationum sunt, idem autem Spiritus. 6② Huic distinctioni Vat. et edd. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 cum cod E contingunt sequentis dist. primum capitulum scil. verba: ⑩ Hic quaeritur usque ad donum dona donari inclusive. ⑪ Sed codd. A B C D et edd. 1, 2 recte hic incipiunt dist. XVIII, sicut etiam antiqui Commentatores, praesertim S. Bonaventura, S. Thomas, B. Albertus, Ricardus a Mediavilla, quod apparet ex divisione textus, quam faciunt. ##1② Wis. 8:1; and the words which follow are Wis. 7:22, where the Vulgate, having inverted the order of words, reads: ① mobile, undefiled, certain [mobilis, inconinquinatus, certus]. ② The Vatican edition together with the other editions, except 1 and 8, and codex D, before attains [attingit] reads who (i.e. the Spirit) [qui] in place of which (Wisdom) [quae], and then codices A C D and editions 1 and 8 again read badly who [qui] for because [quod]. 2② Only the Vatican edition omits and [et]. 3② 1 Cor. 12:11. 4② On the Customs of the Catholic Church, Bk. I, ch. 11, n. 18. ⑤⑤ Next codices A B C and E and editions 1 and 5 omit is [est] after than which nothing [quo nihil melius]. 5② On the Gospel of (St.) John, Tract 74, n. 3. ⑥ On John 3:34 the words of (St.) Augustine are: ⑦ For neither is the Spirit Himself divided, but the gifts through Him: ⑧ for there are divisions of (their) donations; but the same Spirit [Neque enim ipse dividitur Spiritus, sed dona per Spiritum: ⑨ nam divisiones donationum sunt, idem autem Spiritus]. 6② To this distinction the Vatican edition and editions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, together with codex E, conjoin the entire first chapter of the following distinction. ### ① The English translation here has been released to the public domain by its author. The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round () brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English. S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis # S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae # atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis # St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio # Cardinal Bishop of Alba & Doctor of the Church ## Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum # Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences ## Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis # of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris ## PRIMI LIBRI # BOOK ONE ## COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVII. # COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVII ## De invisibili Spiritus sancti missione. ① On the invisible mission of the Holy Spirit. ## PARS I. Determinatur invisibilis Spiritus sancti missio. # PART I The invisible mission of the Holy Spirit is determined. ## ARTICULUS UNICUS. ② Quaestio I. # ARTICLE SOLE ② Question 1 ## Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae, # Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 291-296. # Cum Notitiis Originalibus ③ Latin text taken from Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae, # Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 291-296. # Notes by the Quaracchi Editors. ④ ## Iam nunc accedamus ad assignandum missionem Spiritus sancti, qua invisibiliter mittitur. # Moreover let us now proceed to assign the mission of the Holy Spirit, by which He is invisibly sent etc. ## DIVISIO TEXTUS. # DIVISION OF THE TEXT ## Terminata parte, in qua Magister egit de processione Spiritus sancti visibili, in hac parte agit de invisibili. ⑤ Et dividitur haec pars in duas. ⑥ In prima determinat Magister Spiritus sancti invisibilem missionem secundum suam opinionem. ⑦ In secunda vero, quia sua opinio habuit multos impugnatores, ponit opinionis sua defensionem, ibi: ⑧ Hic quaeritur, si caritas Spiritus sanctus est. # Having finished the part, in which Master (Peter) dealt with the visible procession of the Holy Spirit, in this part he deals with the invisible one. ⑨ And this part is divided into two (parts). ⑩ In the first Master (Peter) determines the invisible mission of the Holy Spirit according to his own opinion. ⑪ In the second, however, because his own opinion had many adversaries

[impugnatures], he puts the defense of his opinion, there (where he says): ¶ Here there is asked, if charity is the Holy Spirit etc. ##Prima iterum pars habet duas: ¶ in prima missionem Spiritus sancti invisibilem notificat; in secunda confirmat, ibi: ¶ Ne autem in re tanta aliquid de nostro etc. #The first part, again, has two (parts): ¶ in the first he makes known the invisible mission of the Holy Spirit; in the second he confirms it, there (where he says): ¶ But lest in such a great matter we put in anything of our own etc. ##Item, prima pars, in qua notificat, habet duas, in quarum prima praedicat suam intentionem, ibi: ¶ Iam nunc accedamus ad assignandam; in secunda, supposito, quod Spiritus sanctus sit amor, quo diligimus Deum et proximum, ostendit, ipsum invisibiliter mitti, quando in nobis efficit hunc effectum; et hoc facit ibi: ¶ Hoc autem ut intelligibilius doceri etc. #Likewise, the first part, in which he makes known, has two parts, in the first of which he foretells his intention, there (where he says): ¶ Moreover let us now proceed to assign; in the second, having supposed, that the Holy Spirit is the love [amor], by which we love [diligimus] God and neighbor, he shows, that He is invisibly sent, when He works this effect in us; and he does this there (where he says): ¶ Moreover so that this may be able to be more intelligibly taught etc. ##Ne autem in tanta re. ¶ Haec est 2 secunda pars, . . . #Moreover, lest in so great a matter. ¶ This is 2 the second part, . . . ##1 ¶ Ex mss. et sex primis edd. supplevimus male omissum invisibilem. 2 ¶ Vat. praeter fidem codd. et ed. 1, verbis Magistri Ne autem in tanta re omissis, propositionem ita incipit: ¶ Similiter secunda pars; mox ob variatam constructionem ponit habet loco et dividitur haec pars in. ##1 ¶ From the manuscripts and the six first editions, we have supplied the badly omitted invisible [invisibilem]. 2 ¶ The Vatican

edition, not trusting in the codices and edition 1, having omitted the words of Master Peter Moreover, lest in so great a matter [Ne autem in tanta re], begins the proposition thus: ¶ Similarly the second part [Similiter secunda pars]; next on account of the varied construction it puts has [habet] in place of and this part is divided into [et dividitur haec pars in]. ##p. 292 in qua positionem suam confirmat; et dividitur haec pars in quatuor partes. ¶ In prima ostendi, quod amor, quo diligimus Deum, est Deus, et 1 similiter amor, quo diligimus proximum. ¶ In secunda vero ostendit, quod amor ille proprie est Spiritus sanctus, ibi: ¶ Cum autem fraterna dilectio sit Deus etc. ¶ In tertio ostendit, quod Spiritus sanctus est caritas, non causaliter, sed essentialiter et formaliter loquendo, ibi: ¶ Sed ne forte aliquis dicat, illud dictum. ¶ Quarto et ultimo concludit, 2 tanquam manifestatum iam, quod Spiritus sanctus tunc mittitur invisibiliter, quando nos facit Dei et proximi dilectores, ibi: ¶ Ex praedictis clarescit, quod Spiritus sanctus caritas est etc. #in which he confirms his own opinion; and this part is divided into four parts. ¶ In the first he shows, that the love [amor], by which we love [diligimus] God, is God, and similarly the love, by which we love neighbor. ¶ However, in the second he shows, that that love properly is the Holy Spirit, there (where he says): ¶ Moreover, since fraternal Love is God etc. ¶ In the third he shows, that the Holy Spirit is Charity, not causally, but essentially and formally speaking, there (where he says): ¶ But lest perhaps anyone say, that there has been said etc. ¶ Fourth and last, he concludes, as (something) already manifested, that the Holy Spirit is then sent invisibly, when He makes us lovers [dilectores] of God and neighbor, there (where he says): ¶ From the aforesaid it grows clear, that the Holy Spirit is Charity etc. ##TRACTATIO QUAESTIONUM. #TREATMENT OF THE QUESTIONS ##Ad intelligentiam huius partis quatuor quaeruntur. #For an understanding of this part four (things) are asked. ##Primo et principaliter propter positionem Magistri quaeritur, utrum praeter donum caritatis increatae sit ponere donum caritatis creatae; et hoc est quaerere, utrum caritas, qua diligimus Deum, sit Spiritus sanctus. #First, and principally on account of the position of Master (Peter), there is asked, whether besides the gift of uncreated Charity there is a positing of a gift of created charity; and this is to ask, whether the charity, by which we love God, is the Holy Spirit. ##Secundo, dato quod sit creata caritas, quaeritur, utrum illa caritas sit diligenda ex caritate. #Second, granted that there is a created charity, there is asked, whether than charity is to be loved from charity. ##Tertio, utrum caritas certitudinaliter possit cognosci ab habente caritatem. #Third, whether charity can be cognized with certitude by the one

having charity.##Quarto, si possit cognosci a3 non habente.##Fourth, if it can be cognized by3 the one not having it.##ARTICULUS UNICUS.0De dono create habitus caritatis, utrum existat, et quomodo diligi et cognosci posit.##ARTICLE SOLE0On the created habit of charity, whether it exists, and in what manner it can be loved and cognized.##QUAESTIO I.0Utrum praeter caritatem increatam poni debeat habitus caritatis creatus.##QUESTION 10Whether besides uncreated Charity there ought to be posited a created habit of charity.##CIRCA PRIMUM, quod non sit ponere aliam caritatem a caritate4 increata, supposita probatione per auctoritates multas, quas adducit Magister in littera,5 probatur rationibus, et primo rationibus sumtis ab essentia caritatis, quae est bonitas, hoc modo.##ABOUT THE FIRST, that there is no positing of a charity other than uncreated Charity,4 having supposed the proof through the many authorities, which Master (Peter) adduces in the text,5 is proven by reasons, and first by reasons taken from the essence of charity, which is goodness, in this manner:##1. Nullum accidens est melius substantia rationali; sed caritas est melior anima rationali, quia eam facit meliorem:0 ergo non est accidens, ergo est substantia.0 Sed constat, quod non irrationalis, ergo rationalis, ergo anima vel Angelus vel Deus; sed non anima vel Angelus:0 ergo Deus.6#1. No accident is better than a rational substance; but charity is better than a rational soul, because it makes it better:0 therefore it is not an accident, therefore it is a substance. 0But it is established, that (it is) not irrational, therefore rational, therefore a soul and/or an Angel and/or God; but not a soul nor an Angel. 0therefore God.6##2. Item, nulla bonitas creata aequivalet beatitudini;7 sed caritas aequivalet beatitudini, quia per caritatem meretur homo, ut efficiatur dignus vita aeterna sive beatitudine:0 ergo caritas non est bonitas creata:0 ergo etc.#2. Likewise, no created goodness is equivalent to beatitude;7 but charity is equivalent to beatitude, because through charity a man merits, to be made worthy of eternal life or of beatitude:0 therefore charity is not a created good:0 ergo etc..##3. Item, omne bonum creatum est bonum per participationem; sed omne bonum alio bono bonum potest intelligi non bonum,8 et sic caderet in ipso malum per diminutionem speciei, modi et ordinis:0 ergo si caritas est bona bonitate creata, caritas potest esse mala vel saltem intelligi mala vel etiam fieri informis; quod falsum est.#3. Likewise, every created good is good through participation; but every good, good by another good, can be understood (to be) not good,8 and in this manner evil would occur in it through the diminution of 0(its) beauty [speciei], 00of (its) standard of measure [modi] and of (its) order:0 therefore if charity is good by a created goodness, charity can be evil and/or at least be understood (to be) evil and/or even become formless [informis]; which is false.##Item, hoc ipsum ostenditur rationibus sumtis a virtute sic.##Likewise, this very (thing) is shown by reasons taken from virtue in this manner:##4. Quanto aliquid virtuosius, tanto paucioribus mediis indiget, ergo si aliquid est potentissimum, nulla alia a se virtute indiget:0 ergo si Spiritus sanctus est potentiae infinitae et ipse est caritas, ergo se ipso, non alio, inflamat affectum ad amorem: 0non est ergo ponere caritatem creatam necessario, quae sit habitus.#4. As much as anything (is) more virtuous, so much does it need fewer means, therefore if anything is most powerful, it needs no virtue other than itself:0 therefore if the Holy Spirit is of infinite power and is Himself Charity, therefore by Himself, not by another, He inflames the affection to love [ad amorem]:0 therefore there is necessarily no positing of the created charity, which is a habit.##5. Item, plus distat virtus naturalis a Deo quam voluntas; sed Deus dirigit virtutem naturalem non alio quam sit ipse:90 ergo si ibi non cadit medium, nec in voluntate cadet:0 ergo etc.#5. Likewise, natural virtue is more distant from God than the will; but God directs natural virtue by no other than Himself [non alio quam sit ipse]:90 therefore if no medium falls there, neither does it fall in the will:0 ergo etc..##6. Item, ubi movet virtus motoris primi semper praesens et non potens errare, superfluit aliam virtutem superaddere, ut puta, si manus esset semper coniuncta temoni, non oporteret ibi esse aliam . . .#6. Likewise, where the always-present-and-not-able-to-err virtue of the Prime Mover moves, it is superfluous to add another virtue, as for example, if a man were always conjoined to a pole, it would not be necessary [oporteret] that there be another . . .###40 Fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 restituimus caritate.50 Hic, c. 1-4. et c. 6.60 Sub hoc respectu ait

August. libr. 83 QQ. q. 54: Nec quidquam est melius rationali anima, nisi Deus. Paulo ante verbo irrationalis praefigitur in cod. V est. Beatitudo enim secundum Boeth., III. de Consol. Prosa 2, est status bonorum omnium congregatione perfectus. Mox sequimur plures codd. ut B H K O T Z ff substituendo ut efficiatur loco et efficitur, quod Vat. cum ed. 1 et aliis codd. habet. Boeth., de Hebdomad. ait: Si participatione (bona sunt), per se ipsa nullo modo bona sunt; nam quod participatione album est, per se in eo quod ipsum est, album non est, et de ceteris qualitatibus eodem modo. Mox post creata in Vat. et cod. cc deest caritas, quod tamen invenitur in ceteris mss. et ed. 1. 90 Vat. cum ed. 1, sed contra fere omnes codd. et edd. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 se ipso pro sit ipse, ed. 1 insuper omittit quam. Paulo ante multi codd. cum ed. 1 perperam diligit loco dirigit. Trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have restored Charity [caritas]. Here in chapters 1-4 and 6. In this regard (St.) Augustine, 83 Questions, q. 54 says: Nor is anything better than the rational soul, except God. A little before this codex V prefixes it is [est] to not irrational [irrationalis]. For beatitude according to (St. Severinus) Boethius, On the Consolation of Philosophy, Bk. III, Prose 2, is the state perfected with the congregation of all goods. Next, we follow the many codices, such as B H K O T Z and ff, by substituting to be made [ut efficiatur] in place of and is made [et efficitur], which the Vatican edition, together with edition 1 and the other codices, has. (St. Severinus) Boethius, On the Seven Rules, says: If they are goods by participation, they are per se in no manner goods; for what is white by participation, per se in that which it is, is not white, and of all the other qualities in the same manner. Next after created [creata] in the Vatican edition and codex cc charity [caritas] is lacking, which, however, is found in all the other manuscripts and in edition 1. [Trans. Note: just before this second remark, the translation beauty [species], standard of measure [modus], order [ordo], follows that adopted in the English translation of St. Bonaventure's, Journey of the Mind into God, ch. 1, n. 11, where this same threefold reckoning is had.] The Vatican edition together with edition 1, but contrary to nearly all the codices and to editions 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, has by Himself [se ipso] for Himself [sit ipso]. A little before this many codices together with edition 1 faultily have loves [diligit] in place of directs [dirigit]. p. 293 virtutem; sed Spiritus sanctus est dirigens et adiuvans ipsam volutatem et est coniunctus semper et non potens errare: ergo superfluit aliam caritatem ponere; sed omne superfluum est resecandum: ergo etc. virtue; but the Holy Spirit is the One directing and helping the will itself and is always conjoined and cannot err: therefore it is superfluous to posit another charity; but every superfluous (thing) must be cut off [est resecandum]: ergo etc. Item, rationibus sumtis ab actu ostenditur illud idem. Likewise, this same (thing) is shown by reasons taken from act. 7. Quia actus caritatis est animam recreare; sed non minoris virtutis est recreare, quam creare, ergo si creare solum est ab increato, quod est infinitiae potentiae, ergo et recreare; sed hoc proprium est caritatis: ergo est increata. 7. Because it belongs to the act of charity to recreate the soul; but it belongs not to a lesser virtue to recreate, than to create; therefore if to create is only from the Uncreated, which is of infinite power, therefore also to recreate; but this is proper to charity [caritatis]: therefore it is uncreated. 8. Item, aliquis actus caritatis est unire; sed nulla creatura per vanitatem unitur veritati, sed omnis creatura vanitas: ergo nulla creatura est medium uniendi Deo: si ego caritas est medium uniendi, ergo non est vanitas nec creatura. 8. Likewise, to belongs to any act of charity to unite; but no creatures is united through vanity to the truth; but every creature (is) vanity: therefore no creature is a means for being united to God: if, therefore, charity is a means for being united, therefore it is neither vanity nor a creature. 9. Item, actus caritatis est unumquodque ordinate diligere: ergo si ordinate diligere est diligere unumquodque, secundum quod sibi convenit, cum bonum increatum sit melius creato in infinitum, ergo ipsum magis in infinitum diligibile: ergo si caritas facit Deum diligere, ut diligendus est, caritas facit Deum in infinitum diligere; sed quod exit in actum infinitum est increatum: ergo etc. 9. Likewise, it belongs to the act of charity to love [diligere] each single thing in an ordinate manner: therefore if to love in an

ordinate manner⁰ is ⁰to love each single thing, according to what befits it⁰, since the uncreated Good is better than one created unto an infinite degree [in infinitum], therefore It (is) more lovable unto an infinite degree:⁰ therefore if charity causes one to love God, as He is to be loved, charity causes one to love God unto an infinite degree; but that which goes forth as an infinite act is uncreated:³⁰ ergo etc.##SED CONTRA:⁰ 1. Caritas est principium reformandi animam quantum ad potentiam voluntatis, sed anima quantum ad alias potentias, scilicet irascibilem et rationalem, reformatur per virtutes creatas:⁰ ergo pari ratione et concupiscibilis; sed eius reformatio⁴ est caritas:⁰ ergo etc.#BUT ON THE CONTRARY:⁰ 1. Charity is the principle of reforming the soul as much as regards the power of the will, but the soul as much as regards the other powers, that is the irascible and rational, is reformed through created virtues:⁰ therefore for an equal reason the concupiscible; but its reformation⁴ is charity:⁰ ergo etc.##2. Item, ubi est reformatio, ibi est conformatio et informatio, et ubi est informatio, ibi est aliquid informans, quod se habet per modum formae, sed omnis forma rei creatae est creata;⁰ Deus enim nullius est forma perficiens:⁰ ergo etc.#2. Likewise, where there is a reformation, there is a conformation and an information, and where there is an information, there is something informing, which holds itself through the manner of a form, but every form of a created thing has been created; for God is the perfecting form of no thing:⁰ ergo etc.##3. Item, caritas est principium vivendi; unde Hugo de sancto Victore:⁵⁰ ⁰ Scio, anima mea, quod amor est vita tua ⁰; sed omnis vita, existens per participationem in aliquo, est ab aliquo informante, ex quo et vivificabili fiat unum; sed ex Deo et anima non potest fieri unum:⁰ ergo necesse est ponere in anima aliquam caritatem creatam, quae vivificet.#3. Likewise, charity is the principle of living; whence Hugo of St. Victor (says):⁵⁰ ⁰ I know, oh my soul, that love is thy life ⁰; but every life, existing through a participation in something, is by something informing (it), out which and (something else) vivifiable there comes to be one (thing); but out of God and the soul there can not come to be one (thing):⁰ therefore it is necessary to posit in the soul some created charity, which vivifies (it).##4. Item, omne quod est in aliquo possibili ad mortem, est in⁶ illo per aliquod separabile; sed vita gratiae est in anima possibili ad moriendum morte culpae:⁰ ergo per aliquod separabile; hoc autem non est Deus, quia impossibile est Dei praesentiam separari ab aliquo:⁰ ergo est aliquid creatum.#4. Likewise, everything which is in something capable of death [possibili ad mortem], is in⁶ it through something separable; but the life of grace is in a soul able to die [possibili ad moriendum] by the death of fault:⁰ therefore through something separable; but this is not God, because it is impossible that the God's presence be separated from anything:⁰ therefore it is something created.##5. Item, caritas est principium gratificandi; sed gratificatio est illud,⁷ in quo distinguitur bonus ad malo, iustus ab impio, non tantum in actu, sed etiam in quiete, ut parvulus vel adultus dormiens:⁰ ergo cum distinctio non sit boni a malo per bonitatem increatam, quia illa omnibus est communis, caritas dicit quid creatum.⁸⁰ Et iterum, cum distinctio quiescentium non sit per actum vel usum, sed habitum, patet quod caritas dicit habitum creatum.#5. Likewise, charity is the principle of being gratified, but gratification is that,⁷ in which (someone) good is distinguished from (someone) evil, the just from the impious, not only in act, but also in rest, as a little child and/or adult sleeping:⁰ therefore since the distinction of good from evil is not through uncreated Goodness, because that (gratification) is common to all (rational beings), ⁰charity⁰ means something created.⁸⁰ And again, since the distinction of those resting is not through an act and/or use, but habit, it is clear that ⁰charity⁰ means a created habit.##6. Item, caritas est principium merendi; sed non quia bona facimus, ideo boni sumus, sed magis e converso:⁰ ergo⁹ caritas prius facit bonum, quam eliciat actum; sed cum aliquis de non bono fit bonus, necesse est aliquid poni in ipso de novo, et hoc non potest esse actus:⁰ ergo habitus.#6. Likewise, charity is the principle of meriting; but not because we do good (works), are we for that reason good, but rather the other way around:⁰ therefore⁹ charity first makes one good before it elicits an act; but since someone from not (being) good is made good, it is necessary that something be posited in him anew, and this cannot be an act:⁰ therefore a habit.##7. Item, Deus alio modo cooperatur in operatione meritoria quam

naturali, quia si non alio modo, tunc redit error Pelagii, quod ex naturalibus posset homo mereri; si ergo alio modo, cum per virtutem increatam omni naturae cooperetur, necesse est, quod in operatione creata meritoria cooperetur mediante alia virtute: sed haec non potest esse nisi creata: ergo etc.##7. Likewise, God cooperates in a meritorious operation in a manner other than natural, because if not in another manner, then returns the error of Pelagius, that a man could merit out of natural (things); therefore if in another manner, since He cooperates through uncreated virtue with every nature, it is necessary, that in a meritorious, created operation He cooperate by means of some virtue: but this cannot be but a created one: ergo etc.##8. Item, videtur, quod Magister erraverit, quia qui dividit opera Trinitatis haereticus est; sed Magister posuit, quod caritas, qua nos diligimus Deum, sit Spiritus sanctus proprie: ergo ponit, quod nostrum diligere, quod est effectus in creatura, sit solius Spiritus sancti; et ita dividit opera Trinitatis.##8. Likewise, it seems, that Master (Peter) has erred, because he who divides the works of the Trinity is a heretic; but Master (Peter) posited, that the charity, by which we love God, is properly the Holy Spirit: therefore he posits, that our own loving [diligere], which is an effect in a creature, belongs to the Holy Spirit alone; and thus he divides the works of the Trinity.##9. Item, qui dicit, quid creatum esse increatum, errat; sed caritas, qua diligimus Deum et proximum, ut communiter tenetur, est quid creatum: sed Magister dixit, hanc esse Spiritum sanctum: ergo erravit.##9. Likewise, he who says, that something created is uncreated, errs; but the charity, by which we love God and neighbor, as is commonly held, is something created: but Master (Peter) said, that this is the Holy Spirit: therefore he erred.##10 Cfr. supra d. 14. a. 2. q. 2. fundam. 7. Paulo ante codd. W Y post virtutis est repetunt animam.20 Ex mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 substituimus sed loco et. Mox post omnis creatura cod. X addit est.30 Fide plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 expunximus infinitum et, quod Vat. praemittit verbo increatum.40 Ed. 1 reformativum.50 De Arrha animae, in princ.: Scio, quod vita tua dilectio est. In quo textu Vat., multis codd. cum edd. 1, 6 refragantibus, Scito.60 Ex fere omnibus codd. et sex primis edd.

supplevimus male omissum in.70 Vat. contra antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 id loco illud, et paulo infra et adultus pro vel adultus dormiens.80 Codd. inter se dissentiunt; plures cum Vat. et ed. 1 non falso caritas non dicit quid commune; alii falso caritas dicit quid commune, ex quo tamen lectio codd. O U Z, quam in textum recepimus, quaeque distinctior est, confirmari videtur. Cod. T a manu secunda in margine caritas enim increata dicit quid commune, sed superflue, utpote repetitio propositionis praecedentis; lectio vero eiusdem primitiva, in qua verba, de quibus agitur, prorsus omittuntur, non est spernenda, immo magis placeret quam ceterae, si firmiore auctoritate fulcieretur; quod si haec praeferatur, interpunctio esset mutanda ita, ut proxime sequens propositio coniungatur cum praecedenti.90 In Vat. incongrue omittitur ergo, quod in mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 invenitur.##10 Cf. above d. 14, a. 2, q. 2, fundament 7. A little before this the codices W and Y repeat recreate the soul [animam recreare] before than [quam].20 From the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3 and 6, we have substituted but [sed] in place of and [et]. Next after every creature [omnis creatura] codex X adds is [est].30 Trusting in the very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have expunged the infinite and [infinitum et], which the Vatican text puts before the word uncreated [increatum].40 Edition 1 reads reformative [reformativum].50 On the Earnest Money of the Soul, at the beginning: I know, that thy life is love. In which text the Vatican edition, breaking with many codices and with editions 1 and 6, reads I shall know [Scito].60 From nearly all the codices and the six first editions, we have supplied the badly omitted in [in].70 The Vatican edition, contrary to the more ancient codices and edition 1, has that [id] for that [illud], and a little below this and an adult [et adultus] for and/or an adult sleeping [vel adultus dormiens].80 The codices dissent among themselves; very many, together with the Vatican edition and edition 1, not falsely have charity does not mean something common [caritas non dicit quid commune]; others falsely charity means something common [caritas dicit quid commune], from which the reading of codices O U X, which we have received in the text and which is more distinct, seems to be confirmed. Codex T has by a second hand in the margin for uncreated Charity means something common

[caritas enim increata dici quid commune], but superfluously, as it is a repetition of the preceding proposition; but the primitive reading of the same, in which the words, which are under consideration, are utterly omitted, is not to be spurned, nay rather would be more pleasing than all the others, if it were supported by a firmer authority; for if this be preferred, the punctuation would have to be changed such that the next following proposition be conjoined with the preceding one. [Trans. note: In the preceding phrase that has uncertain reference; if taken as referring to what follows, it would be understood as referring to charity, and hence the reading of the second group of codices; if taken as referring to something more distant beforehand, it could only logically refer to gratification, because Goodness would take this [hac] and distinction would take it itself [ipsa] and hence understood as gratification, which is common to all rational beings, it refutes the misunderstanding among the codices, and supports the received text: the argument being: Charity is the principle of gratification, gratification the principle of distinguishing the good from the bad; which distinction is on account of created goods, not the uncreated Good; hence, since gratification is common to all created, rational beings, charity itself must be something created.]⁹⁰ In the Vatican edition there is incongruously omitted therefore [ergo], which is found in the manuscripts and editions 1, 2 and 3.###p. 294CONCLUSIO. Praeter caritatem in ceatam ponit debet caritas, quae est habitus creatus et animam informans.#CONCLUSION Besides uncreated Charity there ought to be posited the charity, which is a created habit, informing the soul.##RESPONDEO: Ad praedictorum intelligentiam est notandum, quod circa hoc est et fuit ab antiquo duplex opinio. Quorundam enim, ut Magistri et sequacium suorum, est opinio, quod Spiritus sanctus est essentialiter caritas, qua Pater et Filius diligunt nos, et etiam qua nos diligimus Deum.#I RESPOND: For the understanding of the aforesaid it must be noted, that about this there is and was from ancient (times) a twofold opinion. For of certain ones, as Master (Peter) and his followers, there is the opinion, that the Holy Spirit is essentially the Charity, by which the Father and the Son love [diligunt] us, and even That by which we love God.##Et quidam voluerunt dicere, quod intellectus huius positionis hic est.¹⁰ Dicunt enim, quod, sicut lux potest tripliciter considerari, scilicet in se et in transparenti et in extremitate perspicui terminati. primo modo est lux, secundo modo lumen, tertio modo hypostasis coloris² ita Spiritus sanctus potest considerari in se, et sic est amor Patris et Filii; potest rursum considerari ut in anima humana inhabitans, et sic Spiritus sanctus dicitur gratia; potest etiam considerari ut unitus voluntati, et sic est caritas, qua nos diligimus Deum. Unde dicunt, quod Spiritus sanctus est nostra caritas, non per appropriationem, sed per unionem. Quemadmodum enim solus Filius est homo vel est³ incarnatus; et tamen tota Trinitas est incarnationem operata, sed tamen solus Filius unitus: sic, quamvis tota Trinitas faciat unionem Spiritus sancti cum voluntate, solus tamen Spiritus sanctus unitur voluntati, et ideo solus est caritas.##And certain ones wanted to say, that this is the understanding of this position.¹⁰ For they say, that, just as light can be considered in a threefold manner, that is, in itself and in (something) transparent and on the extremity of some bright surface [perspicui terminati] in the first manner it is light [lux], in the second manner the light (of the luminous body) [lumen], in the third manner a hypostasis of color² so the Holy Spirit can be considered in Himself, and in this manner is the Love [amor] of the Father and the Son; He can, again, be considered as One indwelling in a human soul, and in this manner the Holy Spirit is said (to be) grace; He can also be considered as One united to the will, and in this manner is the Charity, by which we love God. Whence they say, that the Holy Spirit is our Charity, not through an appropriation, but through a union. For according to the measure the Son alone is Man and/or has been² incarnate; and yet the whole Trinity has worked the Incarnation, but the Son alone, however, (is) united: in the same manner, though the whole Trinity works the union of the Holy Spirit with the will, yet the Holy Spirit alone is united to the will, and for that reason He alone is (its) charity.##Ratio autem movens ad ponendum hoc est auctoritas Apostoli, primae ad Corinthios sexto:40 Qui adhaeret Deo unus Spiritus est, et etiam similitudo. Dicunt enim, quod, sicut Filius procedit per

modum naturae et ita naturae unitur,⁵ sic Spiritus sanctus per modum voluntatis, et ideo voluntati unibilis et unitus. ¶ Et quia voluntas vertibilis est, non sic natura, ideo Spiritus sanctus unitur separabiliter, sed Filius inseparabiliter, et ideo longe inferiori modo quam Filius; et quibus sic unitur, se ipso facit diligere. #Moreover the reason moving one to posit this is the authority of the Apostle, in the sixth (chapter) of the First (Letter) to the Corinthians:4 ¶ He who adheres to God is the one Spirit, and also a similitude. ¶ For they say, that, just as the Son proceeds through a manner of nature and thus is united⁵ to a nature, so the Holy Spirit through the manner of will, and for that reason unite-able [unibile] and united to the will. ¶ And because the will is vertible, not so nature, for that reason the Holy Spirit is united in a separable manner [separabiliter], but the Son in an inseparable manner [inseparabiliter], and for that reason in a far inferior manner than the Son, and to whom He is united in this manner, He by Himself makes (them) love. ##Sed haec positio non potest stare, quia Spiritus sanctus non est unibilis; et praeterea, si esset unibilis, aut per naturam, aut per gratiam. ¶ Non per naturam, ergo per gratiam: ¶ ergo adhuc oporteret⁶ esse habitum gratiae disponentem animam ad susceptionem talis unionis; et ita redit contrarium. ¶ Ideo non credo, quod Magister hoc modo fuerit huius opinionis. #But this position cannot stand, because the Holy Spirit is not unite-able; and besides, if He were unite-able, either (He is such) through Nature, or through grace. ¶ Not through Nature, therefore through grace: ¶ therefore it would still be necessary [oporteret]⁶ that there be a habit of grace disposing the soul to the undertaking of such a union; and thus it contradicts itself [redit contrarium]. ¶ For that reason I do not believe, that Master (Peter) belongs to this opinion in this manner. ##Et propter hoc aliter dicendum, quod illud: ¶ quo diligimus Deum, tripliciter est accipere: ¶ aut quo diligimus effective, et sic caritas sive amor est totius⁷ Trinitatis et Spiritus sancti appropriate, aut quo diligimus exemplariter, et sic Spiritus sanctus, qui est unio Patris et Filii et nexus amborum, est⁸ unitas, ad cuius imitationem caritas nos nequit, secundum quod dicit Dominus, Ioannis decimo septimo:9 ¶ Ut sint unum, sicut et nos unum sumus; aut quo diligimus formaliter, et sic secundum opinionem Magisteri est animi affectio. #And on this account it must be said in another manner, that that (phrase): ¶ by which we love God, one is to accept in a threefold manner: ¶ either as ¶ that by which ¶ we effectively love ¶, and in this manner charity or love [amor] appropriately belongs to the whole⁷ Trinity and to the Holy Spirit, or as ¶ that by which we exemplarily love ¶, and in this manner the Holy Spirit, who is the Union of the Father and the Son and the Nexus of Both, is⁸ the Unity, to the imitation of Which charity ties us, according to which the Lord says, in the seventh (chapter of the Gospel of St.) John:9 ¶ That they may be one, just as We are even One; or as ¶ that by which we formally love ¶, and in this manner according to the opinion of Master (Peter) it is an affection of the spirit [animi affectio]. ##Et in his omnibus verum dixit nec erravit, sed deficit, quia praeter hoc est ponere caritatem secundum communem opinionem, quae sit¹⁰ habitus creatus animam informans. ¶ Et ratio huius sumitur a parte essentiae eius, virtutis et operationis. #And in all these he said the truth and did not err, but he was deficient, because beside Him there is a positing of the charity according to the common opinion, which is¹⁰ a created habit informing the soul. ¶ And the reason for this is taken on part of its essence, virtue and operation. ##A parte essentiae, quia caritas est bonitas creaturae rationalis, ipsam perficiens et distinguens et ordinans et disponens ad vitam aeternam: ¶ ergo necesse est, quod sit eius¹¹ formalis perfectio. #On part of (its) essence, because charity is the goodness of a rational creature, perfecting and distinguishing and ordering and disposing it to eternal life: ¶ therefore it is necessary, that it be its¹¹ formal perfection. ##1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur primo, quod caritas est melior anima rationali; dicendum, quod non est ibi comparatio, quia ubi unum propter alterum, ibi tantum unum;¹² unde habens caritatem bonus est propter caritatem. ¶ Vel non cadit ibi comparatio, quia non uniformiter dicitur bonum. ¶ Nam substantia rationalis dicitur bona, quia ordinabilis in finem, caritas bona, quia ordinans. #1. To that, therefore, which is objected first, that charity is better than the rational soul; it must be said, that there is no comparison there, because where one (is said) on account

of the other, there (is) only one (being);¹² whence the one having charity is good on account of charity. And/or a comparison does not occur there, because good is not said uniformly. For a rational substance is said (to be) good, because it can be ordered [ordinabilis] unto an end, charity good, because (it is) the one ordering.##2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod aequivalet beatitudini; dicendum, quod aequivalet secundum divinam aestimationem, quae¹³ opus caritatis aestimat dignum vita aeterna sive tanta remuneratione.##2. To that which is objected, that it is equivalent to beatitude, it must be said, that it is equivalent according to a divine assessment [divinam aestimationem], which¹³ assesses the work of charity (to be) worthy of eternal life or of such a great remuneration.##3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod si est bonum per participationem, tunc eius bonitas est permutabilis in infortitatem; dicendum, quod aliquid¹⁴ . . .##3. To that which is objected, that if it is a good through participation, then its goodness is permutable into a state of being unformed [in infortitatem]; it must be said, that something¹⁴ . . .###10 Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 potest demonstrari per similitudinem loco hic est.0 Paulo ante cod. 0 omittit quidam; cod. V autem ibi addit etiam.20 Hoc explicatur verbis S. Thomae, hic q. 1. a. 1:0 quia hypostasis coloris est lux, et color nihil aliud est quam lux incorporata. 000 Plura de hoc habet S. Bonaventura, II. Sent. d. 13. a. 2. q. 2; et III. Sent. d. 23. dub. 4.0 Cfr. etiam0 I. Sent. d. 3. p. I. dub. 7.30 Ex antiquioribus mss. supplevimus est.40 Vers. 17, ubi Vulgata:0 Qui autem adhaeret Domini, unus etc. 000 Mox post etiam Vat. absque ulla auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 adiungit movet eos.50 Aliqui codd. ut A I T aa cum ed. 1 unitus, cui cod. aa addit est.60 Vat. cum cod. cc, antiquioribus tamen codd. cum ed. 1 refragantibus, oportet.70 Fide vetustiorum mss. restituimus non bene omissum totius.80 Corrupta lectio Vat. et cod. cc, in qua, paulo ante omissio qui, hic loco est ponitur et, deinde post unitas nova incipit propositio, resarcitur ope antiquiorum codd. et ed. 1. 00 Cod. Z quoniam loco qui, et plures codd. falso ponunt aliorum pro amborum.90 Vers. 21.100 Postulantibus antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1, substituimus sit loco est.110 In Vat. et cod. cc desideratur eius, quod alii codd. cum ed. 1 bene exhibent.120 Aristot., III. Topic. c. 2:0 Si alicubi alterum alterius gratia; nihil enim eligibiliora utraque quam unum:0 ut sanum fieri et sanitas, quam sanitas etc.130 Nonnulli codd. ut A S T W cc minus congrue qui, ed. 1 cum uno alteroque cod. ut I quia. 0Mox cod. bb reputat pro aestimat.140 Cod. T addit est et.##10 The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and in edition 1, reads can be demonstrated through a similitude [potest demonstrari per similitudinem] at the end of this sentence, in place of this is [hic est].0 A little before this codex 0 by omitting certain ones [quidam] reads instead they, codex V, however, adds there also [etiam].20 This is explained by the words of St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 1:0 because a hypostasis of color is light, and color is nothing other than incorporated light. 000 St. Bonaventure has more on this in Sent., Bk. II, d. 13, a. 2, q. 2, and Sent., Bk. III, d. 23, dubium 4.0 Cf. also Sent., Bk. I, d. 3, p. I, dubium 7.0 [Trans. note:0 Cf. the Scholium to Sent., Bk. II, d. 13, a. 2, q. 1, for more on the distinction of lux and lumen, and the Trans. Note to a. 1, q. 2, of that same Distinction, for the English translations of these terms.]30 From the more ancient manuscripts, we have supplied has been [est].40 Verse 17, where the Vulgate reads:0 But who adheres to the Lord, is one etc.. 000 Next after also a similitude [etiam] the Vatican edition, without any authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, inserts moves them [moveret eos].50 Some codices, such as A I T and aa, together with edition 1, read united [unitus] for is united [unitus]; codex aa furthermore adds has been [est] to this.60 The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, yet breaking with the more ancient codices together with edition 1, reads it is necessary [oportet].70 Trusting in the older manuscripts, we have restored the not well omitted whole [totius].80 The corrupt reading of the Vatican edition and codex cc, in which, a little before this having omitted who [qui], puts and [et] here in place of is [est], and then after Unity [unitas] begins a new sentence, is repaired with the help of the more ancient codices and edition 1. 000 Codex Z has since He [quoniam] in place of who [qui], and very many codices falsely put of the Others [aliorum] for of Both [amborum].90 Verse 21.100 As required by the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted the subjunctive form for is

[sit].¹¹ In the Vatican edition and codex cc its [eius] is wanting, which the other codices together with edition 1 do well to exhibit.¹² Aristotle, Topics, Bk. III, ch. 20: If (there is) anywhere one for the sake of the other; regardless of whether the two are more eligible than the one: as to become healthy and health, than health etc..¹³ Not a few codices, such as A S T W and cc have less congruously Who [qui], edition 1 together with one and the other codex, such as I, has because He [quia] instead. Next codex bb has reputes [reputat] for assesses [aestimat].¹⁴ Codex T adds is and [est et].###p. 295 dicitur bonum per participationem dupliciter: aut quia participans et ordinatum, aut quia participatio et ordinatio. Primo modo est bonum habens caritatem, secundo modol caritas; et ideo potest non esse, quia non est ipsa essentia bonitatis, sed participatio; tamen ens2 non potest non esse bona vel ordinata, quia est ipse ordo amoris. Unde solvendum ad3 illud per distinctionem; et in hoc patent rationes sumtae ab essentia. #is said (to be) a good through participation in a twofold manner. #either because (it is) participating and ordinate, or because (it is) a participation and an ordination. In the first manner it is a good having charity, in the second manner (it is)1 charity; and for that reason it can not be, because it is not the essence itself of a goodness, but (rather) a participation (in it); however, being (a participation),2 it cannot not be good and/or ordinate, because it is the very order of love [est ipse ordo amoris]. Whence it must be solved according to3 that, through a distinction; and in this are clear the reasons taken from essence. ##A parte enim virtutis necesse est ponere caritatem habitum creatum. Nam caritas, qua diligimus Deum, est virtus, non tantum quia4 Deus cooperatur nobis, sed etiam quia nostra voluntas cooperatur Deo: Adiutores enim Dei sumus;5 et quia, cum cooperamur Deo, necesse est nos sibi conformari, necesse est, quod ab illa summa caritate relinquatur in nobis aliquod exemplatum in nostro affectu, per quod moveatur6 illi conformiter. Voluntas enim libera est et nata moveri ad opposita: et ideo ponitur virtus caritatis creatae in nobis, non propter defectum a parte Dei nobiscum operantis, sed voluntatis nostrae sibi cooperantis. #For on the part of virtue it is necessary to posit a created habit of charity. For the charity, by which we love God, is a virtue, not only because4 God cooperates with us, but also because our will cooperates with God: For we are Gods helpers;5 and because, when we cooperate with God, it is necessary that we be conformed to Him, it is necessary, that from that Most High Charity there be left in us some copy [aliquod exemplatum] in our affection, through which it is moved6 in a manner conformed to It [illi conformiter]. For the will is free and is born to be moved according to what is placed in its way [ad opposita]: and for that reason there is posited the virtue of created charity in us, not on account of a defect on the part of God working with us, but (on the part) of our will cooperating with Him. ##4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod virtus potentissima non indiget virtute media, verum est; sed caritas non est propter illius virtutis indigentiam, sed potius voluntatis suscipientis, quae indiget aliquo habitu disponente. #4. To that which is objected, that a most powerful virtue does not need a virtue as a means, it is true; but charity is not on account of the need of His virtue, but rather (on account of the need) of the will taking-it-up, which needs some disposing habit. ##5. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod Deus cooperatur naturae sine virtute creata; dicendum, quod Deus regit naturam, sicut instituit, et natura uniformiter currit; et ideo non indiget aliquo7 regulante. Non sic est de voluntate, quae movetur difformiter; et ideo indiget aliquo habitu regulante et disponente ipsam. Vel dicendum, quod aliud est de natura et voluntate; quia natura non habet moveri nisi iuxta se, vel infra sed voluntas supra: et ideo indiget aliquo elevante ipsam. #5. To that which is objected, that God cooperates with a nature without a created virtue; it must be said, that God rules a nature, just as He has instituted (it), and a nature runs uniformly; and for that reason it does not need anything7 regulating (it). Not so is it concerning the will, which is moved difformly, and for that reason it needs some habit regulating and disposing it. And/or it must be said, that one thing concerns a nature and another a will, because a nature does not have to be moved, except according to itself, and/or from below, but the will from above: and for that reason it needs something elevating it. ##6. Ad illud quod

obiicitur, quod virtus primi motoris est praesens; dicendum, quod non sufficit praesentia, sed necesse est, quod recipiens influentiam habeat habilitatem et conformitatem; et hoc est per virtutem creatam.##6. To that which is objected, that the virtue of the Prime Mover is present; it must be said, that (His) presence is not sufficient, but it is necessary, that the one receiving the influence have an ability and a conformity (for Him); and this is through the created virtue.##A parte etiam operationis ponitur necessitas, quia reformatio sive8 recreatio, unio et dilectio non tantum sunt ab aliquo ut ab efficiente, sed etiam ut ab informante.¶ Informans autem caritas creata est; et ex hoc patent obiecta ex parte actus sive operationis.##Also on the part of operation a necessity is posited, because a reformation or8 recreation, a unification [unio] and a loving [dilectio] are not only by something as by one effecting, but also as by one informing.¶ Moreover, informing charity is created, and from this are clear the objections from the part of act or operation.##7. Nam quod obiicitur, quod recreatio9 est ab increato; verum est per modum efficientis, sicut et creatio; sed reformatio ulterius relinquit10 formam; et ideo necesse est ponere habitum informantem.##7. For what is objected, that a recreation9 is from the Uncreated; it is true through the manner of (its) efficient (Cause), just as also a creation; but a reformation leaves10 a further form; and for that reason it is necessary to posit an informing habit.##8. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod vanitas non unit11 veritati; dicendum, quod gratia potest considerari secundum quod ex nihilo, et sic est vanitas, et sic non unit; vel secundum quod est influentia secundum divinam praesentiam, et sic habet veritatis expressam similitudinem, et tali modo unit.##8. To that which is objected, that vanity does not unite11 to truth; it must be said, that grace can be considered according to which (it is) from nothing, and thus is vanity, and in this manner it does not unite, and/or according to which it is an influence according to the Divine Presence, and in this manner hit has an express similitude of truth, and in such a manner it does unite.##9. Ad illud quod obiicitur,12 quod caritas facit diligere Deum, quantum est diligendus etc.; dicendum, quod hoc potest intelligi dupliciter:¶ vel quantum Deus deberet diligi in se, et sic falsum est, quia cum sit bonum infinitum, deberet in infinitum diligi, et tali modo Deus solus se ipsum diligit; vel in quantum est diligendus ab hoc,13 et sic verum est, et tunc diligit in infinitum, non simpliciter, sed secundum aestimationem habentis caritatem.¶ Tantum enim diligit caritas Deum plus quam bonum creatum, quod, si bonum creatum in infinitum multiplicaretur, adhuc magis diligeret Deum.##9. To that which is objected,12 that charity makes one love God, as much as He is to be loved etc.; it must be said, that this can be understood in a twofold manner:¶ either as much as God ought to be loved in Himself, and in this manner it is false, because since He is the Infinite Good, He ought to be loved unto an infinite (degree), and in such a manner God alone loves Himself; and/or inasmuch as He is to be loved by this,13 and in this manner it is true, and then one loves to an infinite (degree), not simply, but according to the assessment of the one having charity.¶ For only charity loves God more than a created good, because, if a created good would be multiplied unto an infinite (degree), it would still love God more.##Quod autem obiicitur in contrarium, concedendum est praeter duo ultima, quae ostendunt Magistrum errasse.##Moreover, what is objected to the contrary, must be conceded, except for the last two, which show that Master (Peter) has erred.¶##8. Quod ergo14 obiicitur, quia dividit opera Trinitatis, dicendum, quod falsum est, quia quod Spiritus sanctus sit caritas, qua diligimus Deum, aut dictum est per appropriationem, aut per unionem, aut certe per exemplaritatem, et sic intelliguntur omnes auctoritates, quas Magister adducit pro se; . . .##8. Because, therefore,14 it is objected, that he divides the works of the Trinity; it must be said, that it is false, because that the Holy Spirit is the Charity, by which we love God, has been said either through appropriation, or through union, or certainly through exemplarity, and thus are all the authorities understood, which Master (Peter) adduces on his own behalf; . . .##10 In aliquibus mss. ut B bb adiungitur est.20 Fide multorum codd. ut A C G K L O S T U V X Z ee ff et ed. 1 supplevimus ens, cuius sensus explicatur lectione cod. R cum est loco tamen ens; plures codd. minus apte cum ens. ¶ Paulo ante codd. aa bb essentialiter bonitas pro essentia bonitatis; cod. I et primo modo potest esse bonum loco et ideo potest non esse, ac mox secundo

modo pro tamen ens.³⁰ Vat. contra mss. et quinque primas edd. est loco ad.⁴⁰ Vat. cum paucis mss. bis qua loco quia.⁵ I. Cor. 3, 9.⁰⁰ Mox praeferimus lectionem paucorum mss. Q T et ee (a poster. manu) ponendo sibi loco similiter, utpote quae conclusionem plenius exhibet; error aliorum mss. explicatur ex eo, quod verbum similiter, si abbreviatur, formae verbi sibi appropinquet.⁶⁰ Codd. non conveniunt inter se; alii cum Vat. moveat, sed iam grammaticae minus bene; ed. 1 moveat; alii codd. ut E H I O T Y Z ee exhibent lectionem ad nobis receptam, quae contextui respondet.⁷⁰ Plurimi codd. cum ed. 1 alio pro aliquo. Paulo ante cod. X movetur loco currit.⁰ In sequenti propositione Vat. praeter fidem mss. et sex primarum edd. movet pro movetur.⁸⁰ Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 restituimus sive loco vel, et paulo infra post etiam adiecimus ut.⁹⁰ Vat. cum cod. cc hic creatio loco recreatio et paulo infra recreatio pro creatio, sed obstat auctoritas aliorum mss. et ed. 1; pauci tamen codd. ut M aa bb cum ed. 2, formaliter loquendo, melius reformatio loco recreatio.¹⁰⁰ Ita plurimi et meliores codd.; Vat. requirit. Lectio a nobis recepta explicatur supra post solut. ad 3, ubi arguitur ex parte virtutis et dicitur: Necesse est, quod ab illa summa caritate relinquatur in nobis aliquod exemplatum in nostro affectu, per quod moveatur illi conformiter.¹¹⁰ Fide plurimorum mss. et sex primarum edd. pro unitur substituimus unit, quod obiectioni magis respondet. Mox post secundum quod supple cum cod. bb est.¹²⁰ Plurimis postulantis mss. et ed. 1, substituimus obiicitur pro obiicit. Dein in multis codd. et ed. 1 minus apte deest caritas.¹³⁰ Plures codd. ut C S V W X falso ad hoc.¹⁴⁰ Vat. cum nonnullis mss. autem; ed. 1 enim. Mox plures codd. ut G H I K T etc. post obiicitur ponunt quod loco quia.^{##10} In some manuscripts, such as B and bb, there is inserted it is [est].²⁰ Trusting in many codices, such as A C G K L O S T U V X Z ee and ff, and in edition 1, we have supplied being (a participation) [ens], the sense of which is explained by the reading of codex R when it is [cum est] in place of however being (a participation) [tamen ens]; very many codices less aptly when being [cum ens]. A little before this codices aa and bb have itself essentially goodness [ipsa essentialiter bonitas] for the essence itself of a goodness [ipsa essential bonitatis], codex I reads and in the first manner it can be good [et primo modo potest esse bonum] in place of and for that reason it can not be [et ideo potest non esse], and next in the second manner [secundo modo] for however being (a participation) [tamen ens].³⁰ The Vatican edition, contrary to the manuscripts and to five first editions, has that must be solved [solvendum est illud] in place of it must be solved according to that [solvendum ad illud].⁴⁰ The Vatican edition, together with a few manuscripts, twice has by which [qua] in place of because [quia].⁵⁰ 1 Cor. 3:9.⁰⁰ Next we prefer the reading of a few manuscripts, Q T and ee (by a later hand), which put to Him [sibi] in place of similarly [similiter], as that which more fully manifests the conclusion; the error of the other manuscripts is explained from this, that the word similarly [similiter], when abbreviated, has nearly the same form as to Him [sibi].⁶⁰ The codices do not agree amongst themselves; some, together with the Vatican edition, read it moves [moveat]; other codices, such as E H I O T Y Z and ee exhibit the reading we have received, which responds to the context.⁷⁰ Very many codices together with edition 1 have another [alio] for anything [aliquo]. A little before this codex X reads is moved [movetur] for runs [currit]. In the following proposition the Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and six of the first editions has moves [movet] for is moved [movetur].⁸⁰ From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have restored or [sive] in place of and/or [vel], and a little below this after also [etiam] we have inserted as [ut].⁹⁰ The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, here reads creation [creatio] in place of recreation [recreatio] and a little below this recreation [recreatio] for creation [creatio], but the authority of the other manuscripts and edition 1 withstand this; yet a few codices, such as M aa and bb, together with edition 1, by speaking formally, have better reformatio [reformatio] in place of recreation [recreatio].¹⁰⁰ Thus very many and better codices; the Vatican edition has requires [requirit]. The reading received by us is explained above after the solution to n. 3, where there is the argument on the part of virtue and it is said: It is necessary, that by that Most High Charity there be left in us some copy in our affection, through which it is moved in a manner conformed to It.¹¹⁰

Trusting in the very many manuscripts and in six of the first editions, we have substituted *does unite* [unit] for *is united* [unitur], which responds more to the objection. ¶ Next after according to which [secundum quod], supply together with codex bb it is [est].¹² ¶ As required by very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *is objected* [obiicitur] for *objects* [obiicit]. ¶ Then in many codices and in edition 1 there is less aptly lacking charity [caritas].¹³ ¶ Very many codices, such as C S V W and X, falsely read for this [ad hoc].¹⁴ ¶ The Vatican edition, together with not a few manuscripts, has moreover [autem]; edition 1 for [enim]. ¶ Next very many codices, such as G H I K T etc., after it is objected [obiicitur] put that [quod] for that [quia].###p. 296formaliter autem loquendo non intelliguntur verae, nec credo, quod Magister sic intellexerit.#but formally speaking they are not understood (to be) true, nor do I believe, that Master (Peter) thus understood (them).##9. Et per hoc patet aliud, quod Magister dicit, quod creatum sit increatum, sed quod sufficiat donum increatum sine creato; et in hoc non fuit error, sed defectus tantum.#9. And through this is clear the other (objection), that Master (Peter) says, that (something) created is uncreated, but that the uncreated Gift is sufficient without the created one; and in this there was no error, but only a defect (of consideration).##SCHOLIION.#SCHOLIUM##I. Obsoleta et communiter reprobata est opinio Magistri, quod non sit in anima caritas creata secundum habitum, sed tantum secundum actum.¶ Iuxta ipsum enim, ut communiter explicatur, Spiritus sanctus voluntatem creatam perficit per se ipsum, non tamen ut forma inherens, sed ut finis, exemplar et motor, ita ut actus caritatis ab anima elicited nullum habitum creatum habeat.¶ Scotus paulo mitius verba Magisteri nititur explicare, scilicet quod Spiritus sanctus non formaliter, sed tantum exemplariter et causaliter sit nostra caritas, quod verissimum est. (Cfr. infra dub. 5.).#I. Obsolete and commonly reprobated is the opinion of Master (Peter), that there created charity is not in the soul according to habit, but only according to act.¶ For according to this, as is commonly explained, the Holy Spirit perfects the created will through Himself, not only as an inhering form, but as End, Exemplar and Mover, such that the act of charity elicited by the soul has no created habit.¶ (Bl. John Duns) Scotus strives to explain the words of Master (Peter) a little more meekly, that is, that the Holy Spirit is not formally, but only exemplarily and causally our charity, which is very true. (Cf. below dubium 5).##II. Novem obiectiones Magistri ita sunt ordinatae, ut tres ex parte essentiae, tres ex parte virtutis et tres ex parte actus accipiantur.¶ Unde etiam S. Bonav. sub eodem triplici respectu contrarias apponit rationes, quas, relicto solito ordine, statim applicat ad solvendas difficultates.¶ Primo loco exhibet falsam quorundam explicationem Magistri, quod Spiritus sanctus solus sibi uniat voluntatem creatam, sicut Filius solus univit sibi naturam humanam.¶ Hunc sensum reprobatur merito ut falsissimum, cum unitas operationis non possit esse nisi ab unitate suppositi, immo naturae; talis autem hypostatica vel naturalis unio voluntatis creatae cum Spiritu sancto est ficta, immo haeretica.#II.¶ The nine objections of Master (Peter) have been so ordered, that three are accepted on the part of essence, three on the part of virtue, and three on the part of act.¶ Whence St. Bonaventure, under the same threefold regard, apposes contrary reasons, which, having departed from his customary order, he immediately applies to solve the difficulties.¶ In the first place he shows that the explanation of Master (Peter) belonging to certain (authors) is false, (which says) that the Holy Spirit alone unites the created will to Himself, just as the Son alone united a human nature to Himself.¶ This sense he meritedly reproves as most false, since a unity of operation cannot be except by a unity of supposit, nay of nature; moreover such a hypostatic and/or natural union of the created will with the Holy Spirit is fictive, nay heretical.##III. In solut. ad 1. argumentatio fit ex axioma Aristotelis:¶ ¶ Ubi unum propter alterum, ibi tantum unum ¶; inde sequitur, quod, si homo propter caritatem est Deo acceptus, una tantum est hic bonitas; ideo non potest fieri comparatio utriusque bonitatis separatae.#III. In the solution to n. 1, the argumentation is made from the axiom of Aristotle:¶ ¶ Where (there is) one on account of the other, there (is) only one ¶; from which it follows, that, if a man is accepted by God on account of charity, there is only one goodness there; for that reason a comparison of each separate goodness cannot be made.##IV. In solut. ad 2. verba:¶ ¶ secundum

divinam aestimationem ¶ idem dicunt ac: ¶ ¶ secundum acceptationem Dei ¶, quae iuxta sententiam communem inter condiciones ad meritum de condigno requisitas numeratur. ¶ De hoc videsis II. Sent. d. 27. a. 2. q. 3, et Breviloq. p. V. c. 2. #IV. In the solution to n. 2 the words: ¶ ¶ according to the divine assessment ¶ [secundum divinam aestimationem] mean the same thing as: ¶ ¶ according to their being accepted by God ¶ [secundum acceptationem Dei], which according to the common sentence is numbered among the conditions required for condign merit. ¶ For more on this see Sent., Bk. II, d. 27, a. 2, q. 3, and Breviloquium, p. V, ch. 2. ##V. De caritate creata: ¶ Breviloq. p. V. c. 1. ¶ ¶ Alex. Hal., S. p. III. q. 61. m. 2. a. 1. 2. 3. ¶ Scot., in utroque scripto hic q. 1. ¶ ¶ S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 1; S. II. II. q. 23. a. 2. ¶ ¶ B. Albert., hic a. 1; S. p. I. tr. 8. q. 36. m. 3, et p. II. tr. 16. q. 98. m. 1. ¶ ¶ Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 1. ¶ ¶ Richard. a. Med., hic a. 1. q. 1. ¶ ¶ Aegid. R., hic 1. princ. q. 1. et. 2. ¶ ¶ Durand., hic q. 1. 2. ¶ ¶ Dionys. Carth., hic q. 1. ¶ ¶ Biel, hic q. 1. #V. On created charity: ¶ Breviloquium, p. V, c. 1. ¶ ¶ Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. III, q. 61, m. 2, a. 1, 2 and 3. ¶ (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, each version (of his Commentary), here in q. 1. ¶ ¶ St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 1; Summa., II. II., q. 23, a. 2. ¶ ¶ Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 1; Summa., p. I, tr. 8, q. 36, m. 3, and p. II, tr. 16, q. 98, m. 1. ¶ ¶ (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 1. ¶ ¶ Richard of Middleton, here in a. 1, q. 1. ¶ ¶ Giles the Roman, here in 1st princ., qq. 1 and 2. ¶ ¶ Durandus, here in qq. 1 and 2. ¶ ¶ (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 1. ¶ ¶ (Gabriel) Biel, here in q. 1. ##10 Vat., plurimis mss. et ed. 1 obnitentibus, illud pro aliud. ## 10 The Vatican edition, with very many manuscripts and edition 1 striving against this, has that (objection) [illud] for the other (objection) [aliud]. ### The English translation here has been released to the public domain by its author. The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round () brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English. S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis # S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae # atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis # St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio # Cardinal Bishop of Alba # & Doctor of the Church ## Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum # Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences ## Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis # of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris ## PRIMI LIBRI # BOOK ONE ## COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVII. # COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVII ## PARS I. # PART I ## ARTICULUS UNICUS. ¶ Quaestio II. # ARTICLE SOLE ¶ Question 2 ## Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae, # Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 296-298. # Cum Notitiis Originalibus ¶ Latin text taken from Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae, # Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 296-298. # Notes by the Quaracchi Editors. ¶ ## QUAESTIO II. ¶ Utrum caritas diligenda sit ex caritate. # QUESTION 2 ¶ Whether charity is to be loved out of charity. ## SECUNDO QUAERITUR, utrum caritas sit amabilis ex caritate; et quod sic, ostenditur hoc modo. # SECOND THERE IS ASKED, whether charity is able to be loved [amabilis] out of charity; and that it is [et quod sic], is shown in this manner. ## 1. Augustinus octavo de Trinitate: 2 ¶ ¶ Nemo dicat: ¶ non novi, quid diligam: ¶ diligat fratrem et diligit ipsam dilectionem ¶: ¶ ergo dilectio est diligenda; ¶ ergo etc. # 1. (St.) Augustine in the eight (book) On the Trinity (says): 2 ¶ ¶ No one says: ¶ I do not know, what I love [diligam]: ¶ he loves (his) brother and he loves love [dilectionem] itself ¶: ¶ therefore love is to be loved; ¶ ergo etc. ## 2. Item, hoc ipsum videtur ratione, quia non est perfecta cognitio nisi illa, qua quis novit se nosse sive novit ipsam notitiam, ergo nec perfectus amor nisi ille, quo quis amat se amare sive amorem; sed caritas est perfectus amor: ¶ ergo etc. # 2. Likewise, this same (thing) seems by reason, because there is no perfect cognition except that, by which one knows [novit] that he knows or knows knowledge [notitiam] itself, therefore neither (is there) a perfect love [amor] except that, by which one loves [amat] that he loves or (loves) love; but charity is perfect love: ¶ ergo etc. ## 3. Item, aliquis diligit proximum et recte, quia videt, eum habere caritatem, sed ¶ propter quod

unumquodque et illud magis ¶:30 ergo magis debet diligere caritatem sive dilectionem.##3. Likewise, anyone loves (his) neighbor and rightly, because he sees, that he has charity, but ¶ that, on account of which each one (is), even more ¶:30 therefore he ought more to love charity or love [dilectionem].##CONTRA:¶ 1. Augustinus in libro primo de Doctrina christiana4 dicit, tantum quatuor esse diligenda ex caritate, scilicet Deum, se ipsum, proximum et corpus proprium, sed caritas sive dilectio non est aliquod horum:¶ ergo non est diligenda ex caritate.##ON THE CONTRARY:¶ 1. (St.) Augustine in the first book On Christian Doctrine4 says, that only four are to be loved out of charity, namely, God, one's self, (one's) neighbor and (one's) body, but charity or love is not any of these:¶ therefore it is not to be loved out of charity.##2. Item, duplex est dilectio, scilicet concupiscentiae et amicitiae; si ergo caritas sive dilectio diligitur, aut ergo dilectione concupiscentiae, aut amicitiae.¶ Non amicitiae, constat, quia amicitia est inter similes et amor, quo aliquis optat alii bonum; caritate autem nemo optat bonum.¶ Item, nec concupiscentiae, quia concupiscentia est rei non habitae:¶ ego cum ex caritate nemo diligat nisi5 habens caritatem, ergo ex caritate non potest quis concupiscere caritatem.¶ ¶ Si tu dicas, quod concupiscit augmentum caritatis, hoc non solvit, quia ego non quaero, nisi utrum caritas habita, secundum quod habita est, possit amari.##2. Likewise, love is twofold, namely of concupiscence and of friendship; if, therefore, charity or love is loved, therefore either by the love of concupiscence, or of friendship.¶ Not of friendship, it is established, because friendship is between similars and (is) the love [amor], by which anyone wishes [optat] good to another; but with charity no one wishes good.¶ Likewise, neither (the love) of concupiscence, because concupiscence is not of something had [rei non habitae]:¶ therefore since no one loves out of charity except5 the one having charity, therefore no one can out of charity completely desire [concupiscere] charity.¶ ¶ If you say, that one completely desires the augment of charity, this does not solve (the matter), because I am not asking, except whether charity had, according to which it is had, can be loved [amari].##3. Item, sicut se habet fides ad credere, et spes ad actum sperandi, ita dilectio sive caritas ad actum diligendi; sed nullus habens fidem credit fidem vel in fidem; quia, sicut dicit Augustinus:6 ¶ Credens scit, . . .##3. Likewise, just as faith is had for believing, and hope for the act of hoping, so love [dilectio] or charity for the act of loving [diligendi]; but no one having faith believes faith and/or in faith, because as (St.) Augustine says:¶ ¶ The one believing knows [scit], . . .##20 Cap. 8. n. 12.¶ Vide hic lit. Magistri, c. 1.30 Aristot., I. Poster. c. 2; in quo textu Vat. cum aliquibus codd. post unumquodque addit tale.¶ Cfr. supra d. 12. q. 2. arg. 1. ad opp.40 Cap. 23. n. 22:¶ Cum ergo quatuor sint diligenda:¶ unum quod supra nos est, alterum quod nos sumus, tertium quod iuxta nos est, quartum quod infra nos est. ¶ In quo textu, uti a S. Bonaventura refertur, Vat. post proximum addit et corpus proximi, quod et multi codd. habent, omissis tamen verbis et corpus proprium; aliqui tandem codd. ut F H Y Z ee cum ed. 1 exhibent lectionem in textum receptum, quae confirmatur etiam ex d. 1. a. 1. q. 2. arg. 1. ad opp., ubi eadem sententia allegatur. ¶ Mox cod. V. aliquid pro aliquod.50 Ed. 1 non loco nisi, eodem sensus.60 Libr. XIII. de Trin. c. 1. n. 3, ubi agit de modo, quo fidem, quae in nobis est, cognoscimus et concludit:¶ Eam (fidem) tenet certissima scientia clamatque conscientia. Et ibid. c. 2. n. 5:¶ Suam igitur quisque fidem apud se ipsam videt. ¶ Mox cod. K post est de addit rebus, et paulo infra post spem Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 adiungit sed habet.##20 Chapter 8, n. 12.¶ See the text of Master (Peter) here in ch. 1.30 Aristotle, Posterior Analytics., Bk. I, ch. 2; in which text the Vatican edition, together with some codices, after each one (is) [unumquodque] adds such [tale]. ¶ Cf. above d. 12, q. 2, opposing argument n. 1.40 Chapter 23, n. 22:¶ Therefore, since there are four to be loved: one which is above us, the other which we are, the third which is besides us, the fourth which is below us. ¶ In which text, as related by St. Bonaventure, the Vatican edition after neighbor [proximum] adds and the body of (one's) neighbor [et corpus proximi], which many codices also have, yet with the words and (one's) own body [et corpus proprium] omitted; yet other codices, such as F H Y Z and ee, together with edition 1, exhibit the reading received in the text, which is confirmed also by d. 1, a. 1, q. 2,

opposing argument n. 1, where the same sentence is quoted. ¶ Next codex V has anything [aliquid] for any [aliquod].⁵ ¶ Edition 1 has not [non] in place of unless [nisi], in the same sense.⁶ ¶ On the Trinity, Bk. XIII, ch. 1, n. 3, where he deals with the manner, by which we cognize the faith, which is in us, and concludes: ¶ Most certain science holds it (i.e. faith) and conscience shouts it. ¶ And ibid., ch. 5, n. 5: ¶ Therefore, anyone sees his own faith itself in himself [apud se]. ###p. 297se credere, et videt, se credere ¶; credulitas autem est de non visis; similiter autem nullus sperat ipsam spem: ¶ ergo a simili nec diligit caritatem, vel si non est simile, quaeritur: ¶ quare non? #that he believes, and sees, that he believes ¶; moreover credulity concerns what has not been seen [de non visis]; moreover, similarly, no one hopes hope itself: ¶ therefore a simili neither does one love charity, and/or if it is not similar, there is asked: ¶ for what reason (is it) not (similar)? ##4. Item, si diligens diligit dilectionem, aut eadem, aut alia. ¶ Si alia, tunc pari ratione et aliam dilectionem diligit alia; et sic erit abire in infinitum. ¶ Si ergo stare est et non contingit abire in infinitum, si diligit, diligitl eadem. ¶ Sed si hoc; contra: ¶ nulla forma specialis super se ipsam reflectitur nisi de primis intentionibus, sicut unitas, veritas, bonitas; unde nullo modo dicitur albedo alba: ¶ ergo nec dilectio dilecta, et sic etc. #4. Likewise, if the one loving loves love, either by the same (love), or by another. ¶ If by another, then for an equal reason he loves another love by another, and thus there will be a departure [abire] unto infinity. If, therefore, it is to stand still and it does not happen to depart unto infinity, if he loves, he lovesl by the same (love). ¶ But if this; ¶ on the contrary: ¶ no special form is reflected upon its very self unless (it) concerns the first intentions (i.e. the transcendentals of being), just as unity, truth, goodness (do); whence in no manner is whiteness said (to be) white: ¶ therefore neither love loved, and thus etc. ##CONCLUSIO. ¶ Caritas creata non amore amicitiae diligenda est, sed amore tum concupiscentiae tum complacentiae. #CONCLUSION ¶ Created charity is not to be loved with the love of friendship, but with the love both of concupiscence and of complacence. ##RESPONDEO: ¶ Dicendum, quod accipiendo dilectionem, secundum quod Deus dilectio est, constat utique, quod ex caritate est diligenda. ¶ Sed accipiendo dilectionem, secundum quod est habitus gratuitus, sic utique² diligenda est, sed non super omnia. #I RESPOND: ¶ It must be said, that accepting love [dilectio], according to which God is love, it is indeed established, that It is to be loved out of charity. ¶ But accepting love, according to which it is a gratuitous habit, thus indeed² is it to be loved, but not above all (things). ##Ad intelligentiam autem obiectorum notandum, quod triplex est amor, scilicet amicitiae, quo aliquis optat alicui bonum;³ concupiscentiae, quo aliquis sibi desiderat aliquid, et complacentiae, quo aliquis requiescit et delectatur in re desiderata, cum praesens est.⁴ ##Moreover for an understanding of the objections it must be noted, that love [amor] is threefold, namely of friendship, by which anyone wishes good to another;³ of concupiscence, by which anyone desires something for himself, and of complacence, by which anyone rests and is delighted in the thing desired, when it is present.⁴ ##Dico ergo, quod caritas amore amicitiae nullo modo est amabilis, quia non est beatificabilis; amore concupiscentiae est amabilis ex caritate, secundum quod diligens desiderat amplius diligere; amore vero⁵ complacentiae, scilicet quod diligens acceptat ipsam dilectionem, qua Deum diligit, hoc⁶ diligenda est caritas, secundum quod iam habetur, eo quod ipsa est bonum valde acceptabile. #I say, therefore, that charity is in no manner able to be loved [amabilis] by the love of friendship, because it is not able to be beatified [beatificabilis]; by the love of concupiscence it is able to be loved out of charity, according to which the one loving [diligens] desires to love more fully; however⁵ by the love of complacence, that is, because the one loving accepts the love itself, by which he loves God, by this⁶ charity is to be loved, according to which it is already had, for the reason that it is itself a very acceptable good. ##1. His visis, patet responsio ad duo prima. ¶ Nam ratio illa ex auctoritate Augustini de Doctrina christiana currit solum quantum ad dilectionem amicitiae, quia Augustinus loquitur de amabili, cui aliquis optat bonum. #1. With these seen, the response to the first two is clear. ¶ For that reckoning runs from the authority of (St.) Augustine On Christian Doctrine only as much as regards the love of

friendship, because (St.) Augustine speaks of the one who is able to be loved, to whom anyone wishes good.##2. Quod secundo obiicitur7 similiter patet.¶ Quamvis enim caritatis habitae, secundum quod habita, non sit concupiscentia, nihilominus tamen est complacentia.¶ Posset tamen dici, quod spiritualis dilectio8 et possessio excitat ad desiderandum, dum reficit, et reficit, dum excitat:¶ ideo simul manent concupiscentiae et complacentia.##2. That which is objected7 second is similarly clear:¶ For although (that) of charity had, according to which it is had, is not concupiscence, yet nevertheless it is complacence.¶ However it might be said, that spiritual love8 and possession excites one to desire, while it refects, and refects, while it excites:¶ for that reason concupiscence and complacence remain together.##3. Ad illud quod obiicitur tertio de fide et spe, dicendum, quod non est simile, quia actus9 fidei de se dicit imperfectionem, similiter et spei; alter enim est rei non visae, alter rei non habitae; et ideo si talis actus reflecteretur, diminueret de ratione habitus; unde qui credit credulitatem, non habet eam,10 et spem similiter; et ideo hae virtutes evacuantur in patria.¶ Sed dilectio est actus completionis et perfectionis, sicut scientia; unde sicut perfecte scit qui scit, se scire, ita perfecte diligit qui amat dilectionem.##3. To that which is objected third, concerning faith and hope, it must be said, that it is not similar, because the act9 of faith of itself means imperfection, similarly also (the one) of hope; for the one is of a thing not seen, the other of a thing not had; and for that reason if such an act is reflected (upon it self), it would diminish in [de] the reckoning of a habit; whence he who believes credulity, does not have it,10 and (he who hopes for) hope similarly; and for that reason these virtues are emptied out [evacuantur] in the Fatherland.¶ But love is an act of completion and of perfection, just as (is) science; whence just as he perfectly knows [scit], who knows, that he knows, so he perfectly loves who loves love [diligit qui amat dilectionem].##4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, aut eadem, aut alia etc.:¶ dicendum, quod eadem quantum ad habitum, sed alia quantum ad actum.##4. To that which is objected, either by the same, or by another etc.:¶ it must be said, that by the same as much as regards the habit, but by another as much as regards the act.##Et quod obiicitur, quod specialia11 non reflectuntur, dicendum, quod reflexio in forma aliquando venit ex natura,12 et sic est in generalibus; aliquando venit ratione eius, in quo est, et sic est in formis, quae sunt in potentiis natis supra se converti, et in quantum supra se convertuntur.¶ Et quoniam potentia cognitiva se ipsam cognoscit, ¶ et voluntas est instrumentum se ipsum movens ¶,13 ideo per scientiam aliquis se et scientiam novit, et per caritatem se et ipsam diligit.##And because it is objected, that special (forms)11 are not reflected; it must be said, that reflection in a form sometimes comes out of nature;12 and so it is in general (forms); sometimes it comes by a reckoning of that, in which it is, and thus is in the forms, which are in powers born to be converted upon themselves, and inasmuch as they are converted over themselves.¶ And since the cognitive power cognizes its very self, ¶ and the will is the instrument moving its very self ¶,13 for that reason through science someone does know himself and science, and through charity loves himself and it.##Et si quaeratur14 ratio, quare potentia intellectiva nata est supra se redire et voluntas, alibi dicitur;15 sed modo tantum sufficiat, quia sunt simplices potentiae et in substantia simplici fundatae et organo non alligatae, et ideo patet, quod non est simile illud quod obiici consuevit:¶ in sensibus alia est potentia, quae videt, et alia, quae16 videt, se videre; quod similiter debeat esse in intellectu.##And if the reason be asked,14 why the intellective power has been born to go back upon itself and the will (likewise), it will be said elsewhere;15 but now it suffices only (to say), that they are simple powers and have been founded in a simple substance and have not been bound to an organ, and for that reason it is clear, that that which is was accustomed to be objected is not similar:¶ ¶in the senses there is one power, which sees, and another, which16 sees, that it sees; wherefore (such a difference) similarly ought to be in the intellect.####10 Nonnulli codd. ut G H K T bb diligit.¶ Paulo infra post primis cod. 0 adiicit est.¶ De hac primarum intentionum reflexione vide supra d. 3. p. I. dub. 3.20 Plures codd. cum ed. 1 omittunt utique.30 Aliqui codd. ut A T etc. et ed. 1 addunt et.40 De triplici hoc amore cfr. III. Sent. d. 29, dub. 4.50 Mss. antiquiores cum ed. 1 exhibent

particulam vero in Vat. omissum.⁶⁰ Scil. amore complacentiae.⁶¹ Multi codd. cum ed. 1 haec loco hoc, sed perperam, quia agitur de eadem caritate respectu triplicis amoris; cod. Y sic pro hoc; Vat. hoc modo.⁷⁰ Vat. cum recentiore cod. cc quaeritur.⁸⁰ Nonnulli codd. ut B G T Y ff cum ed. 1 minus congrue delectatio pro dilectio.⁹⁰ Vat. absque auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 Actus enim loco quia actus.¹⁰⁰ Cod. O hic prosequitur: ut fidem, similiter qui sperat spem, non habet eam ut spem, similiter ut videtur hae virtutes evacuantur etc.¹¹⁰ Cod. Y formae speciales.¹²⁰ In cod. O additur formae in se.¹³⁰ Anselmus, libr. de Concord. praesc. et lib. arb. q. 3. c. 11, in quibus verbis Vat. cum uno alteroque codice minus apte se ipsam loco se ipsum. Mox sequimur cod. T post aliquis ponendo se loco scit, quae lectio ex immediate praecedentibus et sequentibus probatur ut unice admittenda; in aliorum codicum siquidem lectione cognitio reflexiva, de qua hic agitur, non attingitur. Dein cum Vat. pauci codd. post et scientiam addunt suam.¹⁴⁰ Fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 substituimus quaeratur loco quaeritur.¹⁵⁰ Libr. II. Sent. d. 25. p. I. q. 1-3; vide etiam ibid. d. 19. a. 1. q. 1 funam. 4, et III. Sent. d. 27. a. 1. q. 1 in corp.⁶¹ Mox post sed in Vat. et cod. cc adiicitur hoc.¹⁶⁰ Vat. et cod. cc non bene qua contra plurimos codd. ut A B D F G H I P Q T Z ee ff cum ed. 1. Paulo ante ed. 1 post sensibus adiungit quia ex quo.^{##10} Not a few codices, such as G H K T and bb, read he will love [diliget]. A little below this codex O reads it concerns the transcendentals [de primis est intentionibus]. On this reflection of the first intentions see above d. 3, p. I, dubium 3 (and the Scholium, here in II.).²⁰ Very many codices, together with edition 1, omit indeed [utique].³⁰ Some codices, such as A T etc., and edition 1, add and [et].⁴⁰ On this threefold love, cf. Sent., Bk. III, d. 29, dubium 4.⁵⁰ The more ancient manuscripts, together with edition 1, exhibit the particle however [vero], omitted in the Vatican edition.⁶⁰ Namely, by the love of complacence. Many codices, together with edition 1, have this [haec] in place of by this [hoc], but faultily, because he deals with the same charity in respect of a threefold love; codex Y has so [sic] for by this [hoc]; the Vatican edition has in this manner [hoc modo].⁷⁰ The Vatican edition, together with the more recent codex cc, reads is asked [quaeritur].⁸⁰ Not a few codices, such as B G T Y and ff, together with edition 1, have less congruously delight [delectatio] for love [dilectio].⁹⁰ The Vatican edition, without the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, beginning a new sentence, has For the Act [Actus enim] in place of because the act [quia actus].¹⁰⁰ Codex O proceeds thus: as faith, similarly he who hopes for hope, does not have it as hope, similarly, as it seems, these virtues are emptied out etc. [ut fidem, similiter qui sperat spem, non habet eam ut spem, similiter ut videtur hae virtutes evacuantur etc.].¹¹⁰ Codex Y reads special forms [formae speciales].¹²⁰ In codex O there is added of a form in itself [formae in se].¹³⁰ (St.) Anselm, On the Concord of Foreknowledge and Predestination and God's Grace with the Free Will, q. 3, ch. 11, at the end; among which words the Vatican edition, together with one or the other codex, has less aptly its very self (i. e. the will) [se ipsam] in place of its very self (i. e. as instrument) [se ipsum]. Next we follow codex T by placing after anyone [aliquis] himself [se] in place of knows [scit], which reading, from what immediately precedes and follows it, is proven as the only one that can be admitted; in the reading of the other codices reflexive cognition, which it deals with here, is not attained. Then together with the Vatican edition, a few codices read and his own science [et scientiam suam].¹⁴⁰ Trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted be asked [quaeratur] for is asked [quaeritur].¹⁵⁰ Sent., Bk. II, d. 25, p. I, qq. 1-3; see also Bk. II, d. 19, a. 1, q. 1, fundament 4, and Bk. III, d. 27, a. 1, q. 1 in the body of the response. Next after but [sed] in the Vatican edition and codex cc the subject of the verb it [hoc] is explicitly had.¹⁶⁰ The Vatican edition and codex cc have not so well by which it [qua], contrary to the codices, such as A B D F G H I P Q T Z ee and ff, together with edition 1. A little before edition 1 after senses [sensibus] adds because out of which [quia ex quo].^{###p. 298}
 SCHOLION.#SCHOLIUM##I. Primo in genere quaestio resolvitur affirmative et per duplicem conclusionem, scilicet respectu caritatis increatae et creatae. Deinde quoad habitum creatum accuratius determinatur, qua specie amoris triplicis sit

diligendus. #I. First the question is resolved in general affirmatively and through a twofold conclusion, that is, in respect of uncreated and created charity. Then in regard to the created habit there is more accurately determined, by which species of the threefold love [amore] is (love) to be loved. ##II. Solut. ad 1. praesupponit, quod obiectum caritatis in genere sumtae est duplex. Vel enim ipsum est capax beatitudinis, vel solummodo est medium, per quod possit quis adiuvari, ut beatificetur. Ad primum genus pertinent illa tria a S. Augustino enumerata, unde haec amore amicitiae diligere possunt; ad secundum genus omnis creatura pertinet, et sic omnis creatura ut medium ad summum bonum diligere potest. Cfr. super d. 1. a. 1. a. 2. ad 1. #II. The solution to n. 1 presupposes, that the object of charity in general has been taken as twofold. For either the object is capable of beatitude, and/or is only a medium, through which one can be helped, to be beatified. To the first genus pertains those three enumerated by St. Augustine, whence these can be loved [diligere] by the love of friendship [amore amicitiae]; to the second genus pertains every creature, and thus every creature can be loved as a means to the Most High Good. Cf. above d. 1, a. 1, q. 2. in reply to n. 1. ##Primae intentiones, de quibus sermo est in solut. ad 4.* sunt notiones transcendentales: ens, unum, verum, bonum; quae super se ipsas reflectuntur, i. e. de se praedicantur, ut v. g. veritas est una, vera, bona. Formae vero speciales sunt, quae constant ex genere et differentia. Ipsae ex natura sua non possunt apte de se praedicari; interdum tamen hoc fieri potest ratione subiecti, in quo sunt, si hoc habet actus reflexos super se ipsum, sicut est in duabus potentiis voluntatis et intellectus; cfr. supra d. 3. p. I. dub. 3. #The first intentions, which are mentioned in the solution to n. 4,* are the transcendental notions: being, one, the true, the good; which are reflected upon themselves, i. e. are predicated of themselves, as for example, truth is one, true and good. However special forms are those, which are established out of genus and difference. These from their own nature cannot be aptly predicated of themselves; yet sometimes this comes to be by reason of the subject, in which they are, if it has acts reflected upon itself, just as there is in the two powers of the will and intellect, cf. above d. 3, p. I, dubium 3. ##III. Quoad ipsum quaestionem cfr. Summa de Virtutibus, sub nomine Alexandri de Hales Parissi 1507 a Ioan. Petit impressa, coll. 63. a. 7. De hac Summa controversia exorta est occasione eorum, quae a Waddingo (Annales ad an. 1245) aliisque Ordo. Min. auctoribus scripta sunt, scil. quod S. Thom. multa inde in suam Summam theolog., praesertim secundam partem secundae acceperit. Ex adverso Natalis Alexander, Echardus, de Rubeis eo progressi sunt, ut hanc Summam existere sive manuscriptam sive impressam negarent, de quo videri potest de Rubeis, Dissertat. criticae, diss. 15, quae etiam in modernis Summae S. Thom. editionibus impressa est. Sed in hoc falluntur viri doctissimi, cum plura huius Summae exemplaria impressa adhuc supersint, ut in bibliotheca regali Monachii et conventus nostri Trudonopolitano (St. Trond) in Belgio. Ex ipso autem initio huius operis apparet, quod non sit liber distinctus, sed pars alterius operis, scil. magnae Summae Alex. Hal., ut videtur. Attamen huius Summae auctor ipse Alex. Hal. esse non potest, quia multae quaestiones verbotenae sumtae sunt ex hoc Commentario S. Bonaventurae. Videtur potius esse Guiliemi de Melitona, qui 1256, iubente Summo Pontifice Alexandro IV, incompletam Alexandri Hal. summam continuare incepit; sed et ipse post quatuor annos, morte correptus, opus incompletam reliquit. S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 5; S. II. II. q. 25. a. 2. B. Albert., hic a. 3; de hac et seq. q. S. p. I. tr. 8. q. 36. m. 3. q. incid. Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 4. Richard. a. Med., hic a. 1. q. 2. Aegid. R., hic 3. princ. q. 1. Dionys. Carth., hic q. 2. #III. In regard to the question itself, cf. Summa de Virtutibus, published under the name of Alexander of Hales, Paris, 1507, by John the Small, coll. 63, a. 7. On this Summa a controversy arose on account of what Fr. Luke Wadding wrote, in his Annales, A.D. 1245, and on account of what other authors of the Order of Friars Minor wrote, namely that St. Thomas copied much of this work into his Summa Theologiae, especially the secunda pars secundae. On the other hand Natalis Alexander, Echard, and de Rubeis went so far, as to deny that this Summa exists in either its manuscript or written form, concerning which claim one can see de Rubeis Dissertationes criticae, dissertation 15, which is also published in the modern editions of

St. Thomas. Summa. But in this these very learned men err, since very many, printed copies of this Summa still survive, such as that in the Royal Library of Monaco and that in our convent of St. Trond, in Belgium. Moreover, it appears from the beginning of this work, that it is not a separate book, but rather part of another work, namely of the great Summa of Alexander of Hales, as it seems. But of this Summa Alexander of Hales could not himself be the author, because many questions are taken word for word from the Commentaria of St. Bonaventure. It seems rather that it belongs to William of Melito, who in 1256, by the order of the Supreme Pontiff, Alexander IV, began to finish the incomplete Summa of Alexander of Hales, but who after four years, taken suddenly by his own demise, left as an incomplete work. St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 5; Summa., II. II, q. 25, a. 2. Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 3; on this and the following question, Summa., p. I, tr. 8, q. 36, m. 3, q. incid. Bl. Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 4. Richard of Middleton, here in a. 1, q. 2. Giles the Roman, here in 3rd. princ., q. 1. Bl. Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 2.*** Non in solutione ad 4, sed in contrarium, n. 4 explicite dicitur.*** It is not explicitly mentioned in the solution to n. 4, but rather in the Contrary, n. 4.***The English translation here has been released to the public domain by its author. The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round () brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis#S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae#atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis#St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio#Cardinal Bishop of Alba#& Doctor of the Church##Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum#Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences##Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis#of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris##PRIMI LIBRI#BOOK ONE##COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVII.#COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVII##PARS I.#PART I##ARTICULUS UNICUS.#Quaestio III.#ARTICLE SOLE#Question 3##Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 298-300.#Cum Notitiis Originalibus##Latin text taken from Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 298-300.#Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.##QUAESTIO III.#Utrum quis certitudinaliter scire possit, se esse in caritate.#QUESTION 3#Whether anyone can know with certitude, that he is in charity.##TERTIO QUAERITUR, utrum caritas sit certitudinaliter cognoscibilis ab habente. #Et quod sic, videtur.#THIRD THERE IS ASKED, whether charity is cognizable with certitude [certitudinaliter] by the one having (it). #And that it is, seems:##1. Auctoritate Augustini in octavo de Trinitate, et habetur in littera: Qui fratrem diligit, magis novit dilectionem, qua diligit, quam fratrem, quem diligit; sed fratrem novit certitudinaliter: ergo et caritatem.#1. By the authority of (St.) Augustine in the eighth (book) On the Trinity, and as is had in the text (of Master Peter): He who loves (his) brother, knows [novit] more the love, by which he loves, than the brother, whom he loves; but he knows (his) brother with certitude: therefore also charity (with certitude).##2. Item, primae Ioannis secundo: Qui diligit fratrem suum, in lumine manet: ergo si caritas est lumen, cum nihil certius videatur quam lumen, ergo etc.#2. Likewise, by the second (chapter) of the First (Letter of St.) John: He who loves his own brother, remains in the light: therefore, if charity is a light, since nothing is seen more certainly than a light, ergo etc.##3. Item, primae Ioannis secundo: Unctio docebit vos de omnibus, non, inquam, de omnibus cognoscibilibus, sed de omnibus necessariis ad salutem; sed caritas est maxime necessaria ad salutem: ergo eam maxime nos docet unctio Spiritus sancti.#3. Likewise, by the second (chapter) of the First (Letter of St.) John: (His) anointing shall teach you concerning all things, non, I say, concerning all cognizables, but concerning all (things) necessary for salvation; but charity is most necessary for salvation: therefore the anointing of the Holy Spirit teaches us it.##4. Item, quanto aliquid animae est praesentius, tanto certius videtur et cognoscitur; sed caritas animae est praesentissima, quia est in ipsa anima: ergo etc.#4. Likewise, as much as

anything is⁴ more present to the soul, so much is it more certainly seen and cognized; but charity is most present to the soul, because it is in the soul. ¶ ergo etc. ##5. Item, habens fidem certus est, se habere fidem, nihil enim certius est homini sua fide, ut dicit Augustinus:⁵ ergo pari ratione habens caritatem scit, se habere caritatem. #5. Likewise, the one having faith is certain, that he has faith, for nothing is more certain to a man than his own faith, as (St.) Augustine says:⁵ therefore for an equal reason the one having charity knows [scit], that he has charity. ##CONTRA: ¶ 1. Ecclesiastis nono:⁶ Nemo scit, utrum odio, an amore dignus sit: ¶ ergo cum habens caritatem sit dignus amore, nescit se dignum, ergo etc. #ON THE CONTRARY: ¶ 1. ¶ By the ninth (chapter) of Ecclesiastes:⁶ No one knows, whether he is worthy of hatred, or of love: ¶ therefore since the one having charity is worthy of love, he knows not [nescit] that he is worthy, ergo etc. ##2. Item, primae ad Corinthios quarto:⁷ Nihil mihi conscius sum, sed non in hoc iustificatus sum: ¶ ergo videtur, quod homo non habens remorsum possit non esse iustificatus, ergo non habere caritatem, sed nullum signum evidentius est caritatis quam carentia omnis remorsus: ¶ ergo si illud est fallibile, cetera sunt fallibilia. #2. Likewise, by the fourth (chapter) of the First (Letter of St. Paul) to the Corinthians:⁷ I am conscious of nothing for myself, but I am not in this justified: ¶ therefore it seems, that a man not having remorse can not be justified, therefore not have charity, but no sign is more evident of charity, that the lack of all remorse: ¶ therefore if that is fallible, all the others are fallible. ##3. Item, caritatis⁸ est diligere Deum propter se et super omnia, ita quod nihil aequè vel supra vel contra, sed nemo scit, utrum prae omnibus diligat Deum: ¶ ergo nemo scit, utrum habeat certitudinaliter caritatem. #3. Likewise, to charity⁸ it belongs to love God for His own sake and above all (things), such that (one loves) nothing equally and/or above and/or contrary to (Him), but no one knows, whether he loves God before all (else): ¶ therefore no one knows, whether he has charity with certitude. ##4. Item, habens caritatem est Deo acceptus, et hoc⁹ constat nobis et omnibus, quod ista sunt con- / -vertibilia; #4. Likewise, the one having charity has been accepted by God, and this⁹ is established by us and by all, that these (virtues) of ours are con- / -vertible; ##1 ¶ Hic, c. 1.2 ¶ Vers. 10.3 ¶ Vers. 27, ubi Vulgata: ¶ Unctio eius docet vos de omnibus.⁴ ¶ In cod. Z additur propinquius vel.⁵ ¶ Libr. XIII. de Trin. c. 1. n. 3: ¶ Eam (fidem) tenet certissima scientia clamatque conscientia. ¶ Et ibid. c. 2. n. 5: ¶ Suam igitur quisque fidem apud se ipsum videt.⁶ ¶ Vers. 1; Vulgata: ¶ Nescit homo, utrum amore an odio dignus sit.⁷ ¶ Vers. 4. ¶ ¶ Paulo infra post remorsum cod. K addit conscientiae.⁸ ¶ Vat. cum cod. cc caritas, et mox infra loco ita, sed perperam et contra antiquiores codd. cum ed. 1.⁹ ¶ Iuxta antiquiores mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus hoc. ##1 ¶ Here in ch. 1.2 ¶ Verse 10.3 ¶ Verse 27, where the Vulgate reads: ¶ His anointing will teach you concerning all (things).⁴ ¶ In codex Z there is added more near and/or [propinquius vel].⁵ ¶ On the Trinity, Bk. XIII, ch. 1 n. 3: It (i.e. faith) does most certain science hold and conscience shout out. ¶ And ibid., ch. 2, n. 5: ¶ Therefore anyone sees his own faith in [apud] his very self.⁶ ¶ Verse 1; the Vulgate reads: ¶ A man does not know, whether he be worthy of love or hatred.⁷ ¶ Verse 4. ¶ ¶ A little below this after remorse [remorsum] codex K adds of conscience [conscientiae].⁸ ¶ The Vatican edition together with codex cc has charity is loving [caritas est diligere] for to charity it belongs to love [caritatis est diligere], and next beneath which [infra quod] in place of such that [ita quod], but faultily [since God in Latin is masculine in gender] and contrary to the more ancient codices together with edition 1.⁹ ¶ According to the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have inserted this [hoc]. ##p. 299 con- / -vertibilia; sed nemo scit, utrum Deo sit acceptus nisi per revelationem: ¶ ergo nemo scit, se habere caritatem nisi per revelationem. #con- / -vertible; but no one knows, whether he has been accepted by God except through a revelation: ¶ therefore no one knows, that he has charity except through a revelation. ##5. Item, dicit Apostolus, ¹ quod nesciebat, utrum haberet culpam, cum dicit: ¶ sed non in hoc iustificatus sum; ergo ab oppositis, nesciebat, se habere gratiam: ¶ ergo cum caritas non sit sine gratia, ergo etc. #5. Likewise, the Apostle says, that he did not know, whether he had a fault, when he said: ¶ but I am not in this justified; therefore ab oppositis, he did not know, that he had grace: ¶ therefore since charity is not without grace, ergo etc. ##CONCLUSIO.

¶ Homo in statu viae, seclusa revelatione, nec de se nec de alio potest scire certitudinaliter, quod sit in caritate, tamen hoc per signa aliqua potest probabiliter cognoscere. #CONCLUSION¶ A man in the state of wayfarer, apart from a revelation, can neither of himself nor of another know with certitude, that he is in charity, yet one can probably cognize this through some signs. ##RESPONDEO: ¶ Dicendum, quod caritatem cognosci certitudinaliter est dupliciter: ¶ vel in universali, quid sit et qualis esse debeat, et sic utique cognosci potest; alio modo est cognosci caritatem in speciali sive in hoc, et hoc modo nec de se nec de alio, quamdiu homo vivit, potest certitudinaliter scire: ¶ de alio non, quia non novit, quae sunt in homine,³ nisi per signa, quae fallibilia sunt; de se non, et huius potest quadruplex ratio. #I RESPOND: ¶ It must be said, that charity is cognized with certitude² is in a twofold manner: ¶ either in universal, what it is and of what kind it ought to be, and in this manner it can indeed be cognized; in another manner that charity is cognized is in special or in this, and in this manner one can neither of himself nor of another, so long as a man lives, know (it) with certitude: ¶ not of another, because one does not know [novit], what are in a man,³ except through signs, which are fallible; not of himself, and for this there can be a fourfold reason. ##Una et praecipua est divinae acceptationis implicatio; quia caritas iuncta est gratiae gratum facienti, quae ideo dicitur gratum faciens, quia reddit hominem Deo acceptum; et ideo caritas sic vocatur, non tantum quia habet carum amatum, sed etiam quia facit hominem Deo carum. ¶ Et quia nescimus Dei acceptationem certitudinaliter nisi per revelationem, ideo nescimus, nos habere caritatem, nisi per revelationem doceamur. #One and chief (reason) is the implication of the Divine Acceptance; because charity has been joined to the grace which makes one pleasing; which for this reason is said (to be) ¶ making one pleasing, because it renders a man accepted by God, and for that reason charity is so called, not only because it has the dear beloved, but also because it makes a man dear to God. ¶ And because we do not know the Divine Acceptance with certitude except through revelation, for that reason we do not know, that we have charity, unless we be taught through revelation. ##Secunda ratio est similitudo ipsius ad dilectionem acquisitam. ¶ Potest enim contingere, aliquem inflammari ad amandum Deum per assuefactionem, qui corrueat per aliquod peccatum spirituale, et tamen semper afficietur; sicut expresse patet per beatum Bernardum in libro de Amore Dei,⁴ ubi reprehendit superbientes de devotione. #The second reason is the similitude of it to acquired love [dilectionem]. ¶ For it can happen, that someone is inflamed to love [ad amandum] God through becoming accustomed [assuefactionem], who will be thrown down [corrueat] through some spiritual sin, and yet will always have the affection [afficietur]; just as is expressly clear through blessed Bernard in the book On the Love of God,⁴ where he reprehends those who take pride in their devotion [superbientes de devotione]. ##Tertio ratio est nostri oculi lippitudo, quia oculus noster est sicut oculus noctuae ad manifestissima naturae, sicut dicit Philosophus.⁵ ¶ Unde sicut oculus lippus nesciret distinguere inter lumen diei et lumen flammae vel lunae, ita oculus noster spiritualis inter lumen gratiae gratis datae et gratum facientis. #The third reason is the half-blindness of our eye, because our eye is just like the owl to the most manifest (things) of nature, just as the Philosopher says.⁵ ¶ Whence just as a half-blind eye would not know how to distinguish between the light of the day and the light of a flame and/or of the Moon, so our spiritual eye (does not know how to distinguish) between the light of grace freely given and (the grace) which makes us pleasing. ##Quarta ratio est divinorum iudiciorum dispensatio. ¶ Deus enim claudit oculos servorum suorum quantum ad ea quae spectant ad eorum dignitatem, et de quibus possunt efferri. ¶ Unde gratia contraria est superbiae. ¶ Superbia enim aperit oculos ad videndum praerogativas et claudit ad videndum indigentias et defectus, iuxta illud Apocalypsis tertio:⁶ ¶ Dicis, quia dives sum et locupletatus et nullius indigeo, et nescis, quia pauper es et caecus etc. ¶ Sed e contra vir sanctus dicit, se nihil esse, quia claudit⁷ oculos suos Deus ad bona et aperit ad videnda mala. ¶ Et haec est ratio, quare homo non cognoscit caritatem, quae quamvis per se non sufficiat, tamen cum aliis bona est. ¶ Credo tamen, quod illa est praecipua, quae primo dicta est. #The fourth reason is the dispensation of the Divine Judgments. ¶ For God

closes the eyes of His servants as much as regards those (things) which pertain to their dignity, and can be borne off from them. ¶Whence grace is contrary to pride. ¶For pride opens (one's) eyes to see prerogatives and closes (them) to see needs [indigentias] and defects, according to that (verse) in the third (chapter) of the Apocalypse:6 ¶You say, that I am rich and have been enriched and am in need for nothing, and you do not know, that you are poor and blind etc.. ¶But contrariwise the holy man says, that he is nothing, because God closes7 his eyes to goods and opens (them) to see evils. ¶And this is the reason, why a man does not recognize [cognoscit] the charity, which though it is not sufficient through itself, yet with the others is good. ¶I believe, however, that, which has been said first, is the chief (reason).##¶Quamvis autem caritas non possit certitudinaliter cognosci esse in aliquo etiam ab habente8 re- / -spectui . . .#Moreover, though charity cannot with certainly be cognized to be in someone even by the one having (it)8 in respect / to it, . . .##¶10 I. Cor. 4, 4.20 Plures codd. cum edd. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 essentialiter, sed minus ad rem.30 I. Cor. 2, 11:¶ Quis enim hominum scit, quae sunt hominis, nisi spiritus hominis, qui in ipso est? ¶¶¶ Paulo ante Vat., contra plurimos codd. et edd. 1, 2, 3 quia nemo pro quia non. ¶Mox fide mss. substituimus fallibilia pro fallacia et huius loco huiusmodi.40 Duo habentur inter opera S. Bernardi opuscula, quae Dei amorem respiciunt. ¶Unum intitulatur:¶ de Diligendo Deo, estque genuinum; alterum vero:¶ de Natura et dignitate amoris, adscribebatur olim S. Bernardo, sed est Gulielmi, abbatis S. Theodorici. ¶Sententia, quam S. Bonav. hic affert, in praedictis opusculis non invenitur, sed sumta esse videtur ex Guigonis epistola seu tractatu ad Fratres de Monte Dei (qui olim S. Bernardo tribuebatur), ubi in fine primi libri, c. 14, haec orationis definitio exhibetur:¶ ¶ Oratio vero est hominis Deo adhaerentis affectio, et familiaris quaedam et pia allocutio, et statio illuminatae mentis ad fruendum, quamdiu licet ¶; ed deinde legitur:¶ ¶ Nonnunquam etiam purae orationis affectus et bona illa orationis suavitas non invenitur, sed quasi invenit, cum non petentem, non pulsantem et quasi nescientem gratia praevenit; et tanquam genus servorum recipitur in mensa filiorum, cum rudis adhuc et incipiens animus in eum orandi assumitur affectum, qui pro praemio sanctitatis reddi solet meritis perfectorum. ¶Quod cum fit, agitur, ut vel in iudicium suum non liceat scire negligenti, quid negligat . . . vel ut provocatio caritatis amore in eo ultro se offerentis accendat. ¶In quo, proh dolor! plurimi falluntur, quia cum pascentur pane filiorum, iam se esse filios arbitrantur, et deficientes unde proficere debebant, ex visitante gratia evanescunt a conscientia sua, arbitantes se aliquid esse, cum nihil sint, et de bonis Dei non emendantur, sed indurantur, et fiunt de quibus Psalmista dicit:¶ Inimici Domini mentiti sunt et, et erit tempus eorum in saecula. ¶Et cibavit illos ex adipe frumenti et de petra melle saturavit eos (Psalm. 80, 16. seq.).¶ Pascuntur enim a Patre Deo aliquando de pretiosiore gratiae substantia servi, ut affectent esse filii; ipsi vero gratia Dei abutentes efficiuntur inimici. ¶Ut enim abutantur etiam Scripturis sanctis in peccatis vel in concupiscentiis suis, redeuntes ad eas per orationes, dicunt sibi illud uxoris Manuae:¶ Si Dominus voluisset nos occidere, non suscepisset sacrificium de manibus nostris (Iudic. 13, 23) ¶.50 Aristot., II. Metaph. text. 1, quem vide supra pag. 72. nota 9.¶ ¶¶ Deinde Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 nescit pro nesciret.60 Vers. 17, ubi Vulgata:¶ Dicis, quod dives sum et locupletatus: et nescis, quia tu es miser et miserabilis et pauper et caecus.70 Ed. 1 clausit et paulo post cum aliquibus mss. aperuit pro aperit.¶ Pauci codd. omittunt Deus. 80 Codd. inter se dissentiunt; multi indebite omittunt praepositionem ab (forte omissa propter alliterationem verbi habente), cod. X omittit etiam ab; Vat. vero ponit eam loco etiam ab; pauci tantum codd. ut V hh (cod. V verbis transpositis ab etiam) cum ed. 1 exhibent lectionem a nobis acceptatam, quae et in se distinctior est et contextui magis respondet.##¶10 1 Cor. 4:4.20 Very many codices, together with editions 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, read essentially [essentialiter] for with certitude [certitudinaliter], but less to the point.30 1 Cor. 2:11:¶ For who of men knows, what (thoughts) belong to a man, except the spirit of the man, which is in him? [Quis enim hominum scit, quae sunt hominis, nisi spiritus hominis, qui in ipso est?].¶ ¶¶ A little before this the Vatican edition, contrary to very many codices and editions 1, 2, and 3, because no one [quia nemo] for because one does not [quia non]. ¶Next trusting in the

manuscripts, we have substituted fallible [fallibilis] for fallacious [fallacia] and for this [huius] for of this very kind [huiusmodi].⁴ There are two opuscula among the works of St. Bernard, which regard the love of God. One is entitled, On Loving God, and it is genuine; the other however, On the Nature and Dignity of Love, at one time used to be ascribed to St. Bernard, but it belongs to William, the Abbot of St. Theodoric. The sentence, which St. Bonaventure here quotes, is not found among the aforesaid works, but seems to have been taken from Guigo's letter or tract To the Friars of Monte Dei (which at one time was granted to St. Bernard), where at the end of Book I, chapter 14, there is exhibited this definition of prayer [oratio]: However, prayer is the affection of the man adhering to God, and a certain familiar and pious address, and an illumined state [statio] of mind to enjoy (Him), as long as it is allowed; and then there is read: Sometimes even the affection of pure prayer and that good savor of prayer is not found, but (it is) as if one finds (it), when grace precedes the one not seeking (it), not asking for (it) and as if non knowing (it), and like the race of servants is received at the table of sons, when a yet rude and incipient spirit of prayer in one is assumed to be the affection, which is accustomed to be rendered as a reward for holiness according to the merits of the perfect. Which when it comes to be, one considers, that either it is not licit for the negligent to know in his own judgment, what he neglects . . . and/or that the provocation of the charity of the one offering (the prayer) enkindles (him) according to the love in him beyond itself. In which, ah the sorrow! very many fail, because when they feed on the bread of sons, they judge themselves already to be sons, and owing to the fact that they fail to profit from it, they are emptied in their conscience of the visiting grace, judging themselves to be something, when they are nothing, and are not emended by the gifts [bonis] of God, but are hardened, and become (like those) of whom the Psalmist says: The enemies of the Lord have lied and, there will be a time for them unto the ages. And He fed them from the fat of the wheat and from the rock He filled them with honey (Psalm 80:16 ff.). For servants sometimes are fed by God the Father on the more precious substance of grace, so that they feel to be sons; however, as abusers of God's grace they are made into (His) enemies. For to abuse even the Holy Scriptures in sins and/or in their concupiscences, returning to these (Scriptures) through prayers, they say to themselves that (verse) of the wife of Manue: If the Lord had wanted to slay us, He would not have taken up the sacrifice of our hands (Judges 13:23).⁵ Aristotle, Metaphysics, Bk. II, text 1, which is cited above on p. 72, note 9. Then the Vatican edition, contrary to the manuscripts and to edition 1, reads knows not how [nescit] for would not know how [nesciret].⁶ Verse 17, where the Vulgate reads: You say, that I am rich and have been enriched: and you know not, that you are wretched and miserable and poor and blind [Dicis, quod dives sum et locupletatus: et nescis, quia tu es miser et miserabilis et pauper et caecus].⁷ Edition 1 reads closed [calusit] and a little after this, together with some manuscripts, has opened [aperuit] for opens [aperit]. A few codices omit God [Deus].⁸ The codices do not agree amongst themselves; many unduly omit the preposition by [ab] (perhaps omitted on account of the alliteration of the following word habente in the Latin text), codex X omits even by [etiam ab]; the Vatican edition however puts it [eam] in place of even by [etiam ab]; only a few codices, such as V and hh (codex V having transposed the words by even [ab etiam]) together with edition 1, exhibit the reading accepted by us, which both in itself is more distinct and corresponds more to the context.###p. 300re- / -spectui sui, tamen postest per signa probabilia cognosci, maxime per mortificationem concupiscentiae et amoris vani sive mundani et per multa alia signa, quae Sancti dicunt et ponunt.¹in respect / to it, yet it can be cognized through probable signs, most of all through the mortification of the concupiscence and of vain or worldly love and through the many other signs, which the Saints speak of and manifested [ponunt].¹###1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur in contrarium, quod certior est dilectio quam frater; dicendum, quod caritas non tantum dicit dilectionem, sed ultra hoc addit, scilicet,² quod gratuita est. Et quantum ad habitum dilectionis certitudinaliter est cognoscibilis, quantum vero ad illud quod dicit gratuitum, non.¹ To that, therefore, which is objected in the Contrary, that love [dilectio] is more

certain that a brother; it must be said, that charity not only means love, but adds beyond

this, namely, that it is gratuitous. And as much as regard the habit of love it is cognizable with certitude, but as much as regards that which means gratuitous, (it is) not.##2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod caritas est lumen; dicendum, quod quamvis de se caritas sit cognoscibilis, tamen non cognoscitur a nobis, quia oculus noster lippus est.#2. To that which is objected, that charity is a light; it must be said, that although of itself charity is cognizable, yet it is not cognized by us, because our eye is half-blind.##3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod unctio docet nos de omnibus necessariis ad salutem; dicendum, quod verum est eo modo, quo necessaria sunt; sed scire, se habere caritatem, non est necessarium ad salutem, sed solum habere.#3. To that which is objected, that (His) anointing shall teach us concerning all (things) necessary for salvation; it must be said, that it is true in the manner, according to which they are necessary; but knowing [scire], that one has charity, is not necessary for salvation, but only having [it is].##4. Ad illud quod obiicitur de praesentia caritatis, dicendum, quod quamvis substantia habitus sit praesens, tamen conditio, quae concomitatur habitum, scilicet divina acceptatio, non est praesens, immo latens in Dei cognitione et iudicio.#4. To that which is objected concerning the presence of charity, it must be said, that although the substance of the habit be present, yet the condition, which is concomitant with the habit [concomitatur habitum], that is the Divine Acceptance, is not present, nay lies hidden [latens] in God's cognition and judgment.##5. Ad illud quod obiicitur de fide, dicendum, quod non est simile, quia fides dicit habitum purum, non superaddendo acceptationem, sicut caritas, et ideo patet, quod non est simile.#5. To that which is objected concerning faith, it must be said, that it is not similar, because faith means the pure habit, not by the superaddition of acceptance, just as charity (does), and for that reason it is clear, that it is not similar.##SCHOLIUM.#SCHOLIUM##I. Triplex conclusio omnino conformis est doctrinae in Concilio Tridentino (Sess. VI. c. 9. et can. 13. 14) decisae. Cfr. hic dub. 7; Prolog. dub. 4; II. Sent. d. 38. dub. 1; et etiam III. Sent. d. 23. dub. 4; commentar. in Ioan. c. 14. v. 24. (in Supplem. Bonelli).#I. The threefold conclusion is entirely conformable to the doctrine decided in the Council of Trent (Session VI, ch. 9, and canons 13 and 14). Cf. here dubium 7; the Prologue, dubium 4; Sent., Bk. II, d. 38, dubium 1, and also Bk. III, d. 23, dubium 4; and St. Bonaventure's Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, Jn 14:24 (in Bonelli's Supplement).##II. Observandum est, quod S. Doctor in prima ratione pro secunda conclusione his verbis: Caritas iuncta est gratiae gratum facienti, distinguit caritatem a gratia habituali; cfr. etiam III. Sent. d. 27. a. 1. q. 3. Contrariam sententiam, sed minus communem et probabilem, tenet Scotus.#II. It must be observed, that the Seraphic Doctor in the first reason on behalf of the second conclusion with these words, Charity has been joined to the grace which makes one pleasing, distinguished charity from habitual grace; cf. also Sent., Bk. III, d. 27, a. 1, q. 3. The contrary sentence, but less common and probable, is held by (Bl. John Duns) Scotus.##III. Alex. Hal., S. p. III. q. 61. m. 7. a. 3. S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 4; de Verit. q. 10. a. 10. B. Albert., hic a. 4. 5. Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 5. quaestiunc. 1. Richard. a Med., hic a. 1. q. 5. Aegid. R. hic 3. princ. q. 2. Dionys. Carth., hic q. 5.#III. Alexander of Hales, Summa, p. III, q. 61, m. 7, a. 3. S. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 4; On Truth, q. 10, a. 10. Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 4 and 5. (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 5. quaestiuncula 1. Richard of Middleton, here in a. 1, q. 5. Giles the Roman, here in 3rd. princ., q. 2. (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 5.##10 Cfr. Bernard., Serm. 1. in Septuag., Serm. 2. in Octava Paschae et Serm. 2. in Pentec. Paulo ante post signa Vat. cum uno alteroque codice repetit probabilia.20 Ex mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 supplevimus scilicet. Paulo infra plures codd. ut A G H I K T etc. cum ed. 1 id loco illud.##10 Cf. (St.) Bernard, First Sermon in Septuagesima, Second Sermon in the Octave of Easter and the Second Sermon on Pentecost. A little before this the Vatican edition, together with one or the other codex reads through many other probable signs [per multa alia signa probabilia].20 From the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, and 3, we have supplied namely [scilicet]. A little below

this very many codices, such as A G K I K T etc., together with edition 1, read that [id] for that [illud].###The English translation here has been released to the public domain by its author. The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round () brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis#S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae#atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis#St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio#Cardinal Bishop of Alba#& Doctor of the Church##Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum#Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences##Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis#of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris##PRIMI LIBRI#BOOK ONE##COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVII.#COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVII##PARS I.#PART I##ARTICULUS UNICUS.#Quaestio IV.#ARTICLE SOLE#Question 4##Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 300-303.#Cum Notitiis Originalibus##Latin text taken from Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 300-303.#Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.##QUAESTIO IV.#Utrum caritas in universali sit cognoscibilis etiam a non habente eam.#QUESTION 4#Whether charity is cognizable in the universal, even by one not having it.##QUARTO QUAERITUR, utrum caritas sit cognoscibilis a non habente; et quod non, videtur:#FOURTH THERE IS ASKED, whether charity is cognizable by one not having (it); and that (it is) not, seems:##1. Quia omne quod cognoscitur, aut cognoscitur per essentiam, aut per similitudinem. Sed non per essentiam, quia non est essentialiter in anima peccatrice; si ergo cognoscitur, hoc est per similitudinem. Sed contra: secundae ad Corinthios duodecimo dicit Glossa: Tertium genus visionis, quo dilectio intellectiva conspicitur, eas res continet, quae non habent sui similes imagines, quae non sunt ipsae, ergo similitudo caritatis non est aliud quam caritas: ergo si caret quis caritate, caret similitudine eius, et ita nunquam cognoscit caritatem. #1. Because everything which is cognized, either is cognized through (its) essence, or through a similitude. But (charity is cognized) not through essence, because it is not essentially in the soul of a sinner [anima peccatrice]; if, therefore, it is cognized, this is through a similitude. But on the contrary: the Gloss on the twelfth (chapter) of the Second (Letter of St. Paul) to the Corinthians says: The third kind of vision, by which love [dilectio] is caught sight of by the intellective (power), contains those things, which do not have images, which are not themselves, similar to themselves, therefore the similitude of charity is not other than charity: therefore if anyone lacks charity, he lacks its similitude, and thus never cognizes charity. ##2. Item, si non habens caritatem cognoscit eam, aut ergo per speciem innatam, aut per acquisitam, aut per effectum, aut per primam lucem. Non per innatam, quia anima creata est sicut tabula rasa; non per speciem acquisitam, quia omnis species acquisita acquiritur mediante sensu et imaginatione, sed species caritatis non cadit in sensu nec in imaginatione. Item non per effectum, quia nemo cognoscit per effectum aliquid, nisi sciat, quod sit illius effectus. Unde nullus cognoscit per eclypsim interpositionem terrae, nisi sciat, quod interpositio est illius causa. Si ergo per effectum cognoscit, oportet quod sciat prius, quoniam illius est causa caritas, . . . #2. Likewise, if one not having charity cognizes it, either, therefore, through an innate species, or through an acquired one, or through an effect, or through the first light. Not through an innate one, because the created soul is as a tabula rasa; not through an acquired species, because every acquired species is acquired by means of sense and imagination, but the species of charity does not occur in the sense nor in the imagination. Likewise not through an effect, because no one cognizes anything through an effect, unless he knows, that it is its effect. Wherefore no one cognizes through an eclipse (of the Moon) the that the Earth is being interposed [interpositionem terrae], unless he knows, that (the Earth's) being interposed is its cause. If, therefore, one cognizes (it) through an effect, it is necessary [oportet] that he first know, how then [quoniam] charity is its cause, . . . ##3. Supple: caritas cognoscitur. ##

Vat. cum cod. cc omittit Sed, quod tamen exstat in ceteris codd. et ed. 1.40
Vers. 4.0 00 Glossa sumta est ex August., XII. de Gen. ad lit. c. 6.n. 15, ubi
cum ed. 1 pro intellectiva habetur intellecta, et talis explicatio adiungitur:0
Nam homo vel arbor vel sol et quaecumque alia corpora sive caelestia sive
terrestria, et praesentia videntur in suis formis,
et absentia cogitantur imaginibus animo impressis, et faciunt duo genera
visorum, unum per corporis sensus, alterum per spiritum, quo illae imagines
continentur.0 Dilectio autem nunquid aliter videtur praesens in specie qua est,
et aliter absens in aliqua imagine sui simili?0 Non utique, sed quantum mente
cerni potest, ab alio magis, ab alio minus ipsa cernitur; si autem aliquid
corporalis imaginis cogitatur, non ipsa cernitur.50 Vat., paulo ante post
innatam addito seu lucem propriam, hic omittit aut per primam lucem, sed
refragantibus omnibus mss.; ed. 1 autem habet aut in prima luce.60 Aristot.,
III. de Anima, text. 14. (c. 4.):0 Oportet autem sic, ut in tabula in qua nihil
est scriptum actu, quod quidem accidit in intellectu.70 Cfr. Aristot., III. de
Anima, text. 30. et 39. (c. 7. et 8.) et de Sensu et sensibilis c. 6.80 Ita
multi codd. ut A G H I N S T V Y Z ee ff brevius et perbene, in quorum lectione
illius refertur ad praecedens aliquid, dum alii cum Vat. eodem quidem sensu, sed
constructione propositionis variata, quod causa sit illius effectus.90 Cod. X
quod loco quoniam.##30 Supply: charity is cognized.0 00 The Vatican edition
together with codex cc omits But [Sed], which, however, is extant in all the
other codices and in edition 1.40 Verse 4.0 00 The Gloss has been taken from
(St.) Augustine's, On Genesis according to the letter, ch. 6, n. 15, where
together with edition 1 there is had intellectured love [dilectio intellecta] for
love . . . by the intellective (power) [intellectiva], and such an explanation
is added:0 For a man and/or tree and/or the Sun and whatsoever other bodies,
whether celestial or terrestrial, are also seen present in their forms, and
absent are thought of by images impressed upon the spirit [animo], and cause two
genera of (things) seen, one through the senses of the body, the other through
the spirit [spiritum], by which those images are contained. 0But is love never
otherwise seen present in the species by which it is, and otherwise absent in
some image similar to itself? 0Not indeed, but as much as can be discerned by
the mind, it [i.e. love] is discerned by one more, by another less; but if
something belonging to a corporal image be thought of, it is not discerned.50
The Vatican edition, a little after innate [innatam] having added or his own
light [seu lucem propriam], here omits or through the first light [per primam
lucem], but breaking with all the manuscripts, however, edition 1 has or in the
first light [aut in prima luce].60 Aristotle, On the Soul, Bk. III, text 14 (ch.
4):0 But it is bound to be [oportet] in this manner, as on a tablet on which
nothing has been written by the act, which indeed accedes in the intellect.70
Cf. Aristotle, On the Soul, Bk. III, text 30 and 39 (chs. 7 and 8) and On Sense
and sensibles, ch. 6.80 The many codices, such as A G H I N S T V Y Z ee and ff
more briefly and very wee, in which reading its [illius] refers to the preceding
anything [aliquid], while the others together with the Vatican edition indeed in
the same sense, but with a varied construction of sentence, that the cause is
its effect [quod causa sit illius effectus].90Codex X has that [quod] in place
of how then [quoniam].##p. 3010et ita praecognoscit caritatem; non ergo per
effectum.0 Si tu dicas, quod cognoscit in illa veritate aeterna, aut hoc erit
effective, aut formaliter. Si effective, sic omnia cognoscuntur in ea, quae
omnia facit scire, quaecumque sciuntur; si autem formaliter sive exemplariter,
ergo videtur, quod vel imprimit1 aliquam speciem in intellectu, vel necesse est,
quod ipsa veritas vel exemplar conspiciatur; quorum alterum est supra
improbatur,2 alterum autem manifeste falsum.#and thus pre-cognize charity; not,
therefore, through the effect.0 If you say, that he cognizes (it) in that
eternal truth, either this will be effectively, or formally.0 If effectively,
thus all are cognized in that, which causes all to know, whatsoever are known;
but if formally or exemplarily, therefore it seems, that either it impresses1
some species on the intellect, and/or it is necessary, that the truth itself
and/or an exemplar is caught sight of; the former (argument) of which is
disproved,2 but the latter (is) manifestly false.##SED CONTRA:0 1. Peccatores
desiderant caritatem; sed nullus desiderat quod non cognoscit, quia incognita
non possunt diligi, sicut dicit Augustinus:30 ergo ipsi cognoscunt

caritatem.#BUT ON THE CONTRARY: 1. Sinners desire charity; but no one desires what he does not cognize, because the unknown [incognita] cannot be loved, just as (St.) Augustine says:3 therefore they do cognize charity.##2. Item, aliquis habens caritatem potest habere cognitionem de illa; sed omne quod cadit in intellectu apprehendente, potest in memoria conservari; ponatur ergo, quod imprimatur haec cognitio memoriae, et quod demum4 cadat a caritate, constat, quod lapsus a caritate memoriam eius retinuit: ergo adhuc cognoscit eam, ergo caritas potest cognosci a non habente.##2. Likewise, someone having charity can have cognition of it; but everything which occurs in the apprehending intellect, can be conserved in the memory; therefore let one suppose [ponatur], that this cognition is impressed upon the memory, and that at length [demum]4 he falls from charity, it is established, that the one lapsed from charity retains his memory: therefore he still cognizes it, therefore charity can be cognized by one not having (it).##3. Item, si caritas cognoscitur ab habente, aut hoc est per essentiam, aut per similitudinem.5 Sed probo, quod per similitudinem, quia nihil cognoscit intellectus, nisi ab illo informetur; sed caritas est habitus affectus, ergo secundum essentiam illum6 non egreditur: ergo si unitur intellectui et illum informat, hoc est per similitudinem; sed similitudo potest haberi a non habente caritatem: ergo etc.##3. Likewise, if charity is cognized by the one having (it), either this is through (its) essence, or through a similitude.5 But I prove, that (it is) through a similitude, because the intellect cognizes nothing, unless it be informed by it; but charity is a habit of the affection, therefore according to essence (charity) does not step forth from it:6 therefore if it is united to the intellect and informs it, this is through a similitude; but a similitude can be had by one not having charity: ergo etc..##4. Item, Augustinus dicit undecimo de Trinitate,7 quod ad hoc, quod intellectus intelligat quod est in memoria, necesse est, aciem intellectus informari: ergo multo fortius ad hoc, quod intelligat quod est in voluntate: ergo si intelligit caritatem, informatur intellectus aliquo;8 non substantia caritatis: ergo similitudine, ergo idem quod prius.##4. Likewise, (St.) Augustine says in the eleventh (book) On the Trinity, that for this, that the intellect understand what is in the memory, it is necessary, that the insight [aciem] of the intellect be informed: therefore much more strongly for this, that it understand what is in the will: therefore if it understands charity, the intellect is informed by something;8 not by the substance of charity: therefore by a similitude, therefore the same as before.##CONCLUSIO. Caritas etiam a non habente eam potest cognosci, non cognitione experimentalis, sed speculativa, et quidem non per similitudinem a sensibus abstractam, sed per quandam veritatem animae innatam.##CONCLUSIO. Charity can also be cognized by one not having it, not by the cognition of experience, but by speculative (cognition), and indeed not through a similitude abstracted by the senses, but through a certain innate truth of the soul.##RESPONDEO. Dicendum, quod cognitione experientiae non cognoscitur caritas nisi ab habente; cognitione vero speculationis certum est cognosci caritatem etiam a non habente. Modus autem huius cognitionis non potest esse per caritatis essentiam nec per similitudinem a sensibus acquisitam: ergo necesse est, quod sit per similitudinem infusam, vel innatam. Utraque autem, quae sic cognoscuntur ab homine, dicuntur ab Augustino9 cognosci in Veritate aeterna, aut quia Veritas cognitionem infundit, ut Prophetis, aut quia a conditione imprimit, secundum illud:10 Signatum est super nos lumen vultus tui, Domine etc. Caritas autem non cognoscitur a peccatoribus per speciem infusam: ergo oportet, quod per innatam cognoscatur.##I RESPOND. It must be said, that by the cognition of experience charity is not cognized except by the one having (it); however, by the cognition of speculation it is certain that charity is cognized even by the one not having (it). Moreover the manner of this cognition cannot be through the essence of charity, nor through a similitude acquired by the senses. therefore it is necessary, that it be through an infused similitude, and/or an innate one. But both, which are thus cognized by a man, are said by (St.) Augustine9 to be cognized in the Eternal Truth, or because the Truth infuses cognition (of them), as (He did) in the Prophets, or because He impresses (it) from its foundation [a conditione], according to that (verse):10 Sealed upon us is the light of Thy Face, o Lord etc.. But charity is not cognized by sinners through an infused species:

therefore it is necessary [oportet], that it be cognized through an innate one.##Species autem innata potest esse dupliciter: aut similitudo tantum, sicut species lapidis, aut ita similitudo, quodll etiam quaedam veritas in se ipsa. Prima species est sicut pictura; et ab hac creata est anima nuda. Secunda species est impressio aliqua summae veritatis in anima, sicut verbi gratia animae a conditione sua datum est lumen quoddam directivum et quaedam directio naturalis, data est etiam ei affectio12 voluntatis. Cognoscit igitur anima, quid sit rectitudo, et quid affectio, et ita, quid rectitudo affectionis, et cum caritas sit hoc, cognoscit caritatem

per quamdam veritatem, quae tamen veritas est similitudo caritatis; et tunc recte habet . . .#Moreover, there can be an innate species in a twofold manner: either a similitude only, just as the species of a stone, or a such a similitude, that (there is)ll a certain truth in it. The first species is as a picture; and of this the soul has been created bereft [nuda]. The second species some impression of most high truth in the soul, just as by a grace of the Word there has been given to the soul from its foundation a certain, directive light and a certain, natural direction; there has also been given to it an affection12 of will. Therefore the soul cognizes, what is rectitude, and what affection, and thus, what (is) a rectitude of affection, and since charity is this, it cognizes charity through a certain truth, which truth, however, is a similitude of charity; and then (the soul) rightly has . . .###1 Aliqui codd. ut aa bb cum ed. 1 imprimat. Mox ed. 1 post veritas habet sive pro vel.2 In principio huius argumenti, ubi arguitur, quod caritas cognosci non possit per speciem innatam.3 Libr. X de Trin. c. 1. n. 1: Quod quisque prorsus ignorat amare nullo pacto potest.4 Cod. X deinde.5 In Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 additur: Per essentiam non, constat, ex mox loco probo habetur probatur.6 Intellige: affectum. Vat. cum cod. cc perperam, et ceteris codd. cum ed. 1 refragantibus, illam; quae et paulo infra loco sed ponit et haec.7 Cap. 7. et 8. n. 11-14, ubi inter alia dicit: Sed cum cogitatur, ex illa (specie) quam memoria tenet, exprimitur in acie cogitantis, et reminiscendo formatur ea species, quae quasi proles est eius quam memoria tenet.8 Ope mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 expunximus hic a Vat. addittam particulam et.9 Vide infra Scholion, ubi fusius proposita est sententia August. de modo cognitionis humanae. De cognitione prophetali cfr. XII. de Genes. ad lit. c. 31. n. 59: Aliud autem est ipsum lumen, quo illustratur anima, ut omnia vel in se vel in illo veraciter intellecta conspiciat; nam illud iam ipse Deus est etc.10 Psalm. 4, 7. Paulo ante Vat. contra plurimos codd. et ed. 1 nomini Prophetis praefigit perperam in, et mox contra omnes codd. et edd. 1, 2, 3 habet imprimatur loco imprimit.11 Cod. X addit est.12 In cod. 0 additur naturalis.##1 Some codices, such as aa and bb, together with edition 1, have it may impress [imprimat]. Next edition 1 after truth itself [ipsa veritas] has or [sive] for and/or [vel].2 At the beginning of this argument, where it is argued, that charity cannot be cognized through an innate species.3 On the Trinity, Bk. X, ch. 1, n. 1: That which anyone in a word does not know, he cannot by any (nuptial) agreement love [amare nullo pacto potest].4 Codex X has then [deinde].5 In the Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, there is added: Not through its essence, it is established [Per essentiam non, constat], and next in place of I prove [probo] there is had it is proven [probatur].6 Understand: the affection. The Vatican edition together with codex cc faultily, and breaking with all the other codices together with edition 1, has it(i. e. the similitude, or essence) [illam]; which also a little below this in place of but [sed] puts and this [et haec].7 Chapters 7 and 8, nn. 11-14, where among other things he says: But when it is though, out of that (species) which the memory holds, there is expressed in the insight [acie] of the one thinking, and by reminiscing there is formed that species, which is a quasi offspring of that which the memory holds.8 With the help of the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, and 3, we have expunged here the particle and [et], added by the Vatican edition.9 See below in the Scholium, where the sentence of (St.) Augustine concerning the manner of human cognition has been propounded more at length. On the cognition of the Prophets, cf. On Genesis according to the letter, Bk. XII, ch. 31, n. 59: Moreover, (something) else is that light, by which the soul is brightened, to catch sight of all (things) truthfully intellected either in

itself and/or in it; for that (light) now is God Himself etc..10 Psalm 4:7. A little before this the Vatican edition, contrary to very many codices and edition 1, faultily reads among the Prophets [in Prophetis], and next, contrary to all the codices and editions 1, 2 and 3, has it may be impressed [imprimatur] in place of He impresses (it) [imprimit].11 Codex X adds there is [est].12 In codex O there is had a natural affection [affectio naturalis].###p. 302rationem similitudinis, dum accipitur ab intellectu, habet tamen rationem veritatis, prout est in anima.#a reckoning of (its) similitude, while it is accepted by the intellect; yet, it has a reckoning of (its) truth, insofar as it is in the soul.##Unde quod Augustinus dicit,1 quod huiusmodi habitus cognoscuntur in ipsa veritate et per similitudines, quae sunt idem quod ipsae,2 non dicit hoc, quia non fiat aliqua species in intellectu cognoscentis, sed quia in anima non est pura species, sed veritas quaedam ab ipsa veritate impressa; et sic patet responsio ad obiecta.#Wherefore, because (St.) Augustine says,1 that habits of this kind are cognized in truth itself and through similitudes, which are the same as they (are),2 he does not say this, because some species comes to be in the intellect of the one cognizing, but because in the soul there is no pure species, but a certain truth impressed by the truth itself, and thus is clear the response to the objections.##SCHOLIUM.#SCHOLIUM##I. Facta distinctione duplicis cognitionis, scil. experientiae (intuitivae) et speculationis (abstractivae), ipsam quaestionem, quae sane pro theoria de cognitione humana magni momenti est, duplici conclusione resolvit. Deinde modum huius cognitionis speculativae septem propositionibus explicat. Pro confirmatione responsionis hic subiungimus, quae de hac re dicunt Petr. a Tar. et Alex. Hal. Petrus (hic q. 1. a. 5. quaestiunc. 2.): Cognitione experientiae non potest cognosci caritas nisi ab habente, sed cognitione speculativa potest, non per essentiam eius seu per speciem, quae sit idem quod ipsa sic videtur solum ab habente sed per speciem seu per similitudinem, quae non est idem quod ipsa; et hoc dupliciter: vel per speciem acquisitam, quae est similitudo eius vel potius actus ipsius, relictus in memoria ad eius praesentiam, et sic videtur ab illo, qui eam aliquando habuit, nisi speciem illam oblivio deleverit, et sic in patria videbit Sanctus, se fidem et spem habuisse, scil. per quoddam vestigium fidei, ut dicit Augustinus XIV. de Trinitate c. 3; vel per speciem innatam, et sic videri potest a quocumque, non quae sit species tantum, ut species lapidis in anima, quia talem speciem non habet anima concretam caritatis, sed per speciem innatam, quae est res in se, et tamen habet similitudinem cum caritate. Habet enim anima apud se virtutum omnium quaedam semina et per illa habet desiderium et cognitionem quandam universalem virtutum, sicut per principia venit in cognitionem conclusionem. Idem ad objectionem: anima creatur ut tabula rasa, sic respondet: Hoc intelligitur quoad species, quae sunt intentiones tantum, non res; huiusmodi vero habitus innati in se quidem sunt res, in quantum vero per illos cognoscuntur alii (alia?) ut in simili, sunt quasi species. Haec omnia fere ad verbum concordant cum doctrina Seraphici. Alex. Hal., S. p. III. a. 61. m. 7. a. 1. haec habet: Quilibet sive bonus sive malus a creatione habet inditam rationem boni et veri, secundum quod dicit Augustinus et Boethius. Sicut ergo in notione principiorum veri est notio conclusionum in universali, ita in notione boni nobis in universali impressa est notio gratiae in universali; et ex illa notione boni possumus scire, quid est gratia in universali, scilicet quod ipsa est quaedam qualitas in anima. Cum enim gratia sit bonum, et habeamus notionem boni in universali nobis impressam, ex illa possumus arguere, gratiam esse; sed haec erit notio in universali, non in ratione propria. Cfr. ibid. q. 28. m. 1. a. 2. Praeter hos cfr. Richard. a Med., hic a. 1. q. 4. Ex his patet, quod intellectus ex innato lumine veritatis potest formare speciem intelligibilem, aciem intellectus informantem, quae simul habeat rationem similitudinis, dum accipitur ab intellectu, et tamen rationem veritatis, prout est in anima, ut habetur hic in corp.#I. Having distinguished a twofold cognition, namely, that of experience (intuitive) and that of speculation (abstractive), he resolves the question itself, which surely is of the greatest importance for the theory of human cognition, with a twofold conclusion. Then he explains the manner of this speculative cognition with seven propositions. For the confirmation of the response we here subjoin, what (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise and Alexander of Hales say on this manner. (Bl.)

Peter, here in q. 1, a. 5, questiuncula 2, (says): ¶ By the cognition of experience charity cannot be cognized except by the one having (it), but by speculative cognition it can, not through its essence or through a species, which is the same as [quod] it ¶ in this manner it is seen only by the one having (it) ¶ but through the species or through the similitude, which is not the same as it; and this in a twofold manner: ¶ either through an acquired species, which is its similitude and/or rather its act, left in the memory to make it present [ad eius praesentiam], and in this manner it is seen by the one, who once had it; unless one erases that species by forgetfulness, and in this manner a Saint in the Fatherland (of Heaven) shall see, that he had faith and hope, that is, through a certain vestige of faith, as (St.) Augustine says On the Trinity, Bk. XIV, ch. 3; and/or through an innate species, and in this manner it can

be seen by anyone whomsoever, not that which is ¶ a species only, as the species of a stone (is) in the soul, because the soul does not have such a concrete species of charity, but through an innate species, which is the thing in itself, and yet has a similitude with charity. ¶ For the soul has in itself [apud se] certain seeds of all the virtues and through them has a desire and a certain universal cognition of virtues, just as one comes to cognize a conclusion through principles ¶ He responds the same to the objection: ¶ the soul is created as a tabula rasa: ¶ This is understood in regard to the species, which are only intentions, not (in regard to) things; however innate habits of this kind are indeed in themselves things, however inasmuch as through them others are cognized as similar, they are quasi species ¶ All these (words) agree nearly word for word [ad verbum] with the doctrine of the Seraphic (Doctor). ¶ Alexander of Hales, Summa, p. III, a. 61, m. 7, a. 1 has these (words): ¶ Anyone, whether good or evil, has from (his) creation an enriched [inditam] reckoning of good and evil, according to which (St.) Augustine and (St. Severinus) Boethius speak. ¶ Therefore, just as in the notion of the principles of the true there is the notion of conclusions in the universal, so in the notion of the good there has been impressed in us in the universal the notion of grace in the universal; and from that notion of the good we can know, what grace is in the universal, that is that it is a certain quality in the soul. ¶ For since grace is a good, and we have a notion of the good in the universal impressed upon us, from that we can put in clear light [arguere], that grace is; but this will be a notion in the universal, not in a proper reckoning. ¶ Cf. ibid., q. 28, m. 1, a. 2. ¶ Besides these (authors), cf. Richard of Middleton, here in a. 1, q. 4. ¶ From these it is clear, that the intellect can from an innate light of truth form an intelligible species, which informs the intellect's insight, to simultaneously have ¶ a reckoning of (its) similitude, while it is accepted by the intellect, and yet a reckoning of (its) truth, in so as it is in the soul ¶, as is had here in the body (of the response). ##II. Quae in hac quaestione a Seraphico dicuntur non parvi sunt momenti, ut sententia eius de modo cognitionis humane recte intelligatur. ¶ Quid sit cognoscere in veritate aeterna, iam explicatum est supra d. 3. p. I. q. 1. in Scholio. ¶ Quid sit secundum S. Bonaventuram species innata, et quo sensu ipsa animae humanae innata dici possit, hic manifeste docetur, scil. quod hoc secundum habitum sive lumen animae concretam, quod vocatur naturale iudicatorium, non secundum actuales species sive ideas innatas intelligendum sit. ¶ Quod amplius confirmatur et explicatur ab ipso Seraphico Doctore, II. Sent. d. 39. a. 1. q. 2, ubi quaeritur, utrum conscientia sit habitus innatus, an acquisitus. ¶ Reiecta opinione Platonis, quod habitus cognitivi animae sint simpliciter innati, sed oblivioni dati ad tempus, ipse asserit, tres de hac re esse opiniones, in hoc consentientes, quod habitus cognitivi nec sint omnino innati, nec omnino acquisiti, sed quodam modo innati, quodam modo acquisiti; tamen has dissidere in assignando modum, secundum quem hi habitus sint acquisiti vel innati. ¶ Reiectis duabus opinionibus tanquam insufficientibus, concludit, quod ¶ habitus cognitivi sunt quodam modo nobis innati ratione luminis animae inditi, sunt etiam quodam modo acquisiti ratione speciei. ¶ Et hoc quidem verbi Philosophi et Augustini concordat. ¶ Omnes enim in hoc concordant, quod potentiae cognitivae sit lumen inditum, quod vocatur naturale iudicatorium; species autem et similitudines rerum acquiruntur nobis mediante sensu, sicut

expresse dicit Philosophus in multis locis; et hoc etiam experientia docet. ¶ Tum attendendum esse ait distinctionem inter prima principia valde evidentia, quorum ¶ cognitio ratione illius luminis dicitur esse nobis innata, quia lumen illud sufficit ad illa cognoscenda post receptionem specierum sine aliqua persuasione superaddita propter sui evidentiam ¶, et inter cognitionem particularium conclusionum, quarum cognitio acquisita est pro eo, quod lumen nobis innatum non plene sufficit ad illa cognoscenda, sed indiget aliqua persuasione et habilitatione nova etc. ¶ Denique respondendo ad illam quaestionem, utrum omnis cognitio sit a sensu, sic concludit: ¶ Dicendum est, quod non. ¶ Necessario enim oportet ponere, quod anima novit Deum et se ipsam et quae sunt in se ipsa sine adminiculo sensuum exteriorum. ¶ Unde si aliquando dicat Philosophus, quod nihil est in intellectu, quod prius non fuerit in sensu, et quod omnis cognitio ortum habeat a sensu, intelligendum est de illis quae quidem habent esse in anima per similitudinem abstractam; et illa dicuntur esse in anima ad modum scripturae. ¶ Et propterea valde notabiliter dicit Philosophus, quod in anima nihil scriptum est, non quia nulla est in ea notitia, sed quia nulla est in ea pictura vel similitudo abstracta. ¶ Et hoc est, quod dicit August. in libro de Civit. Dei: ¶ Inseruit nobis Deus nobile iudicatorium, ubi quid sit lucis, quid tenebrarum, cognoscitur in libro lucis, qui veritas est, quia veritas in corde hominum naturaliter est impressa. ¶ Hanc sententiam verbotenus sive in hoc sive in alio libro S. Augustini non invenimus. ¶ Ipsa autem breviter complectitur, quae S. August. longiore discursu pluries luculenter probat, praesertim XI. de Civ. Dei c. 27. n. 2, ubi inter alia ait: ¶ Sed lucem illam incorpoream (animalia) contingere nequeunt, qua mens nostra quodam modo irradiatur, ut de his omnibus recte iudicare possimus. ¶ Nam in quantum eam capimus, in tantum id possumus. ¶ Verumtamen inest sensibus irrationalium animantium, etsi scientia nullo modo, at certe quaedam scientiae similitudo . . . Sed nos ea (corporalia) sensu corporis ita capimus, ut de his non sensu corporis iudicemus. ¶ Habemus enim alium interioris hominis ¶ II. ¶ What is said by the Seraphic (Doctor) in this question is of no small importance, for the right understanding of his sentence concerning the manner of human cognition. ¶ What it is to cognize in the eternal truth, has already been explained above in d. 3, p. I, q. 1 in the Scholium. ¶ What, according to St. Bonaventure, is an innate species, and in what sense it can be said (to be) itself innate to the soul, will be here manifestly explained, namely, that this must be understood according to habit or the concrete light of the soul, which is called the natural judgment [naturale iudicatorium], not according to actual species or innate ideas. ¶ Which is more amply confirmed and explained the same Seraphic Doctor, Sent., Bk. II, d. 39, a. 1, q. 2, where there is asked, whether the conscience is an innate habit, or an acquired one. ¶ Having rejected the opinion of Plato, that the cognitive habits of the soul are simply innate, but given to forgetfulness for a time, he asserts, that there are three opinions in this matter, consenting in this, that the cognitive habits are neither entirely innate, nor entirely acquired, but in a certain manner innate, in a certain manner acquired; however, that they disagree in assigning the manner, according to which these habits have been acquired and/or are innate. ¶ Having rejected two opinions as insufficient, he concludes, that ¶ the cognitive habits are in a certain manner innate in us by reason of the enriched light of the soul, they have also in a certain manner been acquired by reason of the species. ¶ And in this indeed the words of the Philosopher and of (St.) Augustine agree. ¶ For all agree in this, that to the cognitive power belongs an enriched light, which is called the natural judgment; but the species and similitudes of things are acquired by us by means of the sense, just as the Philosopher expressly says in many places; and this also experience teaches. ¶ Next he says that one must attend to the distinction between the very evident, first principles, of which ¶ the cognition by reason of the light itself is said to be innate in us, because that light suffices for knowing them after the reception of the species without any superadded persuasion on account of their evidence ¶, and among the cognition of particular conclusions, the cognition of which has been acquired in virtue of this, that the light innate to us does not fully suffice for knowing them, but is lacking some persuasion and new habilitation [habilitatione nova] etc.. ¶ ¶ Then by responding to that question, whether every cognition is from

sense, he concludes in this manner: ¶ It must be said, that (it does) not. ¶ For necessarily one is bound to posit, that the soul knows [novit] god and itself and those (things) which are in it without the support [adminiculo] of the exterior senses. ¶ Whence if the Philosopher sometimes says, that nothing is in the intellect, which was not first in sense, and that every cognition has its rise from the sense, it must be understood of those which indeed have being in the soul through an abstracted similitude; and they are said to be in the soul after the manner of writing. ¶ And on this account the Philosopher very notably says, that nothing has been written in the soul, not because there is in it no knowledge [notitia], but because there is in it no picture and/or abstracted similitude. ¶ And this is, what (St.) Augustine says in the book *On the City of God*: ¶ God has inserted in us a noble judgment, where what belongs to light, what to darkness, is cognized in a book of light, which is truth, because truth has been naturally impressed in the heart of men ¶. ¶¶¶ This sentence verbatim, whether in this or in the other book of St. Augustine, we have not found. ¶ But it briefly comprises, what St. Augustine proves many times by a longer discourse, especially in *The City of God*, Bk. XI, ch. 27, n. 2, where among other things he says: ¶ But they (the animals) are not able to touch that incorporeal light, by which our mind is in a certain manner irradiated, so that we are able to rightly judge of all these (things). ¶ For inasmuch as we grasp it, inasmuch are we able to do that. ¶ Nevertheless there is in the senses of irrational animals, even if it is in no manner a science, but certainly a certain similitude of science . . . But we thus grasp them (corporeal things) with the sense of the body, that we judge of them not by the sense of the body. ¶ For we have another sense belonging to the interior man [alium interioris hominis sensum] . . . ¶¶¶ ¶ Vat. praeter fidem mss. et quinque primarum edd. cum Augustinus dicat. ¶ Supple: res, quae hoc in casu sunt habitus. ¶ Vide supra arg. 1. ad opp. ¶ Vat. incongrue ipse. ¶ Notum est, in Codd. eodem modo scribi ipse et ipsae. ¶ Mox fide mss. et ed. 1 substituimus fiat loco sit. ¶ In fine responsionis ed. 1 solutio pro responsio. ¶¶¶ ¶ The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and in five of the first editions, has since (St.) Augustine says [cum Augustinus dicat]. ¶ Supply: ¶ things, which in this case are habits. ¶ See above in the first argument of the question. ¶ The Vatican edition incongruously has it (is) [ipse]. ¶ It has been noted, that in Codices it [ipse] and these [ipsae] are written in the same manner. ¶ ¶ Next, trusting in the manuscripts and in edition 1, we have substituted comes to be [fiat] in place of is [sit]. ¶ At the end of the response edition 1 has solution [solutio] for response [responsio]. ¶¶¶ ¶ op. 303 sensum isto longe praestantior, quo iusta et iniusta sentimus: ¶ iusta per intelligibilem speciem, iniusta per eius privationem. ¶ Ad huius sensus officium non acies pupillae, non foramen auriculae, non spiramenta narium, non gustus faucium, non ullus corporeus tactus accedit. Ibi me et esse et hoc nosse certus sum, et haec amo atque amare me similiter certus sum ¶. ¶ far more present than this one, by which we sense just and unjust (things): the just through an intelligible species, the unjust through its privation. ¶ To the office of this sense not the sight of the pupil, not the aperture of the ear, not the nostrils of the nose, not the taste of the pallet, not any corporeal touch approaches. In this (interior sense) I am certain that I both am and know it, and I love these (acts) and that I love (them) I am similarly certain ¶. ¶¶¶ III. S. Bonaventura fidelissimum S. Augustini discipulum, sicut in aliis quaestionibus, sic in tota sua de cognitione humana doctrina se comprobatur. ¶ Unde quae circa hanc materiam in hac quaest. disputat non nisi summarium exhibent eorum, quae S. August. more suo et diffuse tractat in pluribus libris v. g. II. de Libero Arb.; de Vera Religione, c. 29. seqq.; XII. de Gen. ad lit. ¶ Operae pretium esse duximus exemplo hoc probare, proponendo ex libris VIII. et IX. de Trinitate ea S. Augustini de cognitione humana fundamenta, quae S. Bonaventura hic vel praesupponit, vel explicite asserit. ¶ III. St. Bonaventure completely proves himself (to be) a most faithful disciple of St. Augustine, just as in other questions, so in his whole work concerning the doctrine of human cognition. ¶ Wherefore, those things, which he disputes about this matter in this question, exhibit not but a summary of those, which St. Augustine treats, according to his own custom and at length in very many (of his) books, v. g., *On Free Will*, Bk. II; *On the True Religion*, ch. 29

ff.; On Genesis according to the letter, Bk. XII. ¶ We consider it worth the while to prove this by example, by proposing from books VIII and IX of St. Augustine's On the Trinity those fundamentals of human cognition, which St. Bonaventure here either presupposes, and/or explicitly asserts.##1. Apertissime ibi distinguit S. Augustinus inter cognitionem sensuum (phantasiae) et intellectus: ¶ Et Carthaginem quidem cum eloqui volo, apud me ipsum quaero, ut eloquar, et apud me ipsum invenio phantasiam Carthaginis, sed eam per corpus accepi, i. e. per corporis sensum . . . Non autem ita quaero, quid sit iustus, nec ita invenio, nec ita intueor, cum id eloquor ¶ etc. (VIII. c. 6. n. 9.).#1. There St. Augustine most openly distinguishes between the cognition of the senses (of the fantasy) and (that) of the intellect: ¶ And indeed, when I wish to speak of Carthage, I seek it in myself [apud me], to speak, and in myself I find the phantasm of Carthage, but I accepted that through (my) body, i.e. through the sense of the body . . . But not thus do I seek, what is just, nor thus do I find, none thus do I intuit, when I speak of it ¶ etc. (On the Trinity, Bk. VIII, ch. 6, n. 9.).##2. Distinguit in cognitione intellectuali conceptus formatos per abstractionem a rebus sensibilibus et non formatos per abstractionem: ¶ Neque enim oculis corporeis multas mentes videndo per similitudinem colligimus generalem vel specialem mentis humanae notitiam, sed intuemur inviolabilem veritatem ¶ (IX. c. 6. n. 9.).#2. He distinguishes in intellectual cognition the concepts formed through abstraction from the sensible things and those not formed through abstraction: ¶ For neither by seeing many minds with corporeal eyes do we gather through similitude a general and/or special knowledge [notitiam] of the human mind, but we intuit the inviolable truth (of it) ¶ (On the Trinity, Bk. IX, ch. 6, n. 9.).##3. Asserit, aliquos conceptus intellectuales, quos habemus, supponere experientiam sive externam sive internam: ¶ Sed quid sit mori, et quid sit vivere, utique scimus, quia et vivimus, et mortuos ac morientes aliquando vidimus et experti sumus ¶ (VIII. c. 5. n. 8.).#3. He asserts, that some intellectual concepts, which we have, suppose experience, whether external or internal: ¶ But what it is to die, and what it is to life, we indeed know, because we also live, and we see and have experienced sometimes the dead and the dying ¶ (On the Trinity, Bk. VIII, ch. 5, n. 8.).##4. Dicit, animae humanae impressam esse notitiam quarundam rerum: ¶ Neque enim in his omnibus bonis, vel quae commemoravi vel quae alia cernuntur sive cognitantur, diceremus aliud alio melius, cum vere iudicamus, nisi esset nobis impressa notio ipsius boni, secundum quod et probaremus aliquid et aliud illi praeponeremus ¶ (VIII. c. 3. n. 4.). ¶ Habemus enim quasi regulariter infixam humanae naturae notitiam . . . Secundum species et genera rerum vel natura insita vel experientia collecta, de factis huiusmodi (miraculis et resurrectione Christi) cogitamus, ut non ficta sit fides nostra ¶ (ibid. c. 4. 5. n. 7.). ¶ Quid igitur de illa excellentia Trinitatis sive specialiter sive generaliter novimus, quasi multae sint tales trinitates, quarum aliquas experti sumus, ut per regulam similitudinis impressam, vel specialem vel generalem notitiam, illam quoque talem esse credamus ¶ etc. (ibid. c. 5. n. 8.).#4. He says, that the knowledge [notiam] of certain things has been impressed on the human soul: ¶ For neither among all these goods, either which I completely remember and/or which are discerned [cernuntur] or cognized, would we say that one is better than another, when we judge in a true manner, unless there has been impressed upon us a notion of the good itself, according to which we would also prove something and prefer [praeponeremus] another to it ¶ (On the Trinity, Bk. VIII, ch. 3, n. 4.). ¶ For we regularly have a knowledge quasi infix in human nature . . . According to the species and genera of things either implanted by nature and/or collected by experience, we think of facts of this very kind (miracles and the Resurrection of Christ), so that our faith is not a fiction ¶ (ibid., ch. 4 and 5, n. 7. ¶¶ What, therefore, do we know [novimus], whether specially or generally, of that Excellence of the Trinity, as there are many such trinitates, some of which we have experienced, so that through the impressed rule of a similitude, and/or a special and/or general knowledge, we also believe It to be such ¶ etc. (ibid., ch. 5, n. 8.).##5. Asserit, quaedam cognosci ab homine in veritate, et etiam in veritate aeterna. ¶ Minime autem dicit, hoc fieri per immediatum aeternarum rationum conspectum, ut Ontologistae volunt; sed intelligi debet secundum illam interpretationem, quam meliores

Scholastici exhibent; cfr. supra d. 3. p. I. q. 1. Scholion. Libr. VIII. c. 6. n. 9. proponit quaestionem, quae cum illa quae a S. Bonav. hic pertractatur, maxime convenit, scil. quomodo homo iniustus cognoscat animum iustum, quem diligit, eamque ita solvit: ¶ Quid sit animus, ut dictum est, novimus ex nobis; inest enim animus nobis. ¶ Quid autem sit iustus, unde novimus, si iusti non sumus? . . . An signa quaedam per motum corporis emicant, quibus ille aut ille homo esse iustus apparet? ¶ Sed unde novit, illa signa esse animi iusti, nesciens, quid omnino sit iustus? ¶ Novit ergo. ¶ Sed ubi novimus, quid sit iustus, etiam cum iusti nondum sumus? ¶ Si extra nos novimus, in corpore aliquo novimus. ¶ Sed non est ista res corporis. ¶ In nobis igitur novimus, quid sit iustus. ¶ Non etiam alibi hoc invenio, cum quaero, ut hoc eloquar, nisi apud me ipsum . . . Et Carthaginem quidem cum eloqui volo, apud me ipsum quaero, ut eloquar, et apud me ipsum invenio phantasiam Carthaginis, sed eam per corpus accipit, i. e. per corporis sensum . . . Non autem ita quaero, quid sit iustus, nec ita invenio nec ita intueor, cum id eloquor . . . Illud mirabile est, ut apud se animus videat, quod alibi nusquam vidit, et verum videat, ipsum verum iustum animum videat, et sit ipse animus, et non sit iustus animus, quem apud se ipsum videt. ¶ Num est alius animus iustus in animo nondum iusto? ¶ . . . An illud quod videt, veritas est interior, praesens animo, qui eam valet intueri? ¶ Neque omnes valent; et qui intueri valent, hoc etiam, quod intuentur, non omnes sunt, hoc est, non sunt etiam ipsi iusti animi, sicut posunt videre ac dicere, quid sit iustus animus. ¶ Quod unde esse potuerunt, nisi inhaerendo eidem ipsi formae, quam intuentur, ut inde formentur et sint iusti animi, non tantum cernentes . . . Et unde inhaerentur illi formae, nisi amando? . . . Homo ergo, qui creditur iustus, ex ea forma et veritate diligitur, quam cernit et intelligit apud se ille qui diligit; ipsa vero forma et veritas non est, quomodo aliunde diligatur. ¶ Neque enim invenimus aliquid tale praeter ipsam, ut eam, cum incognita est, credendo diligamus, ex eo quod iam tale aliquid novimus. ¶ Quidquid enim tale aspexeris, ipsa est; et non est quidquam tale, quoniam sola ipsa talis est, qualis ipsa est ¶ Ibid. c. 9. n. 13: ¶ Vivendum tamen sic esse Dei ministris, non de aliquibus auditum credimus, sed intus apud nos, vel potius supra nos in ipsa veritate conspiciamus. ¶ Illum ergo, quem sic vixisse credimus, ex hoc quod videmus diligimus. ¶ Et nisi hanc formam, quam semper stabilem atque incommutabilem cernimus, praecipue diligeremus, non ideo diligeremus illum, quia eius vitam, cum in carne viveret, huic formae coaptam et congruentem fuisse fide retinemus ¶ Libr. IX. c. 6. n. 9: ¶ Intuemur inviolabilem veritatem, ex qua perfecte, quantum possumus, definiamus, non qualis sit uniuscuiusque hominis mens, sed qualis esse sempiternis rationibus debeat ¶ Ibid. n. 11: ¶ Ipsa vera forma inconcussae ac stabilis veritatis, et in qua furerer homine, bonum eum credens, et in qua consulo, ut bonus ist, eadem luce incorruptibilis sincerissimaeque rationis et meae mentis aspectum et illam phantasiae nubem, quam desuper cerno, cum eundem homine, quem videram, cogito, imperturbabilii aeternitate perfundi ¶ Ibid. c. 7. n. 12: ¶ In illa igitur aeterna veritate, ex qua temporalia facta sunt omnia, formam, secundum quam sumus et secundum quam vel in nobis vel in corporibus vera et recta ratione aliquid operamus, visu mentis aspicimus, atque inde conceptam rerum veracem notitiam tanquam verbum apud nos habemus et dicendo intus gignimus, nec a nobis nascendo discedit ¶ #5. He asserts, that certain (things) can be cognized by man in the truth, and even in the eternal truth. ¶ But he does not at all [minime] say, that this comes to be through an immediate complete sight [conspectum] of eternal reasons, as the Ontologists want; but he ought to be understood according to that interpretation, which the better Scholastics exhibit; cf. above d. 3, p. I, a. 1, Scholium. ¶ In On the Trinity, Bk. VIII, ch. 6, n. 9, (St. Augustine) proposes the question, which together with that which is here treated thoroughly by St. Bonaventure, greatly convenes, namely ¶ in what manner does an unjust man cognize the just spirit [animum iustum], which he loves, and he solves that (question) thus: ¶ What a spirit is, as has been said, we know [novimus] out of ourselves; for there is a spirit in us. ¶ But what a just one is, whence to we know it, if we are not just? . . . Or do certain signs show themselves [emicant] through the movement of a body, by which this or that man appears to be just? ¶ But whence does he know, that those signs are of a just spirit, not knowing, what entirely a just one is? ¶ Therefore he does know. ¶ But where do we know, what a just one

is, even when we are not yet just? If we know (this) outside of ourselves, we know in some body. But this matter does not belong to a body. Therefore we know in ourselves, what a just one is. I do not even find this elsewhere, when I seek, to speak of this, except in my very self . . . And when I want to speak of Carthage, I seek it in myself, to speak, and in myself I find the phantasm of Carthage, but I accepted it through the body, i. e. through the sensing of the body . . . But I do not thus seek, what a just one is, nor do I find (it) thus nor thus do I intuit (it), when I speak of it . . . It is (something) wonderful, that a spirit sees in itself, what elsewhere it never sees, and that it sees (something) true, that it sees the true, just spirit itself, and that it is a spirit itself, and that it is not the just spirit, which it sees in its very self. There is not another just spirit in the not-yet-just spirit, is there? . . . Or is that which it sees, an interior truth, present to the spirit, which prevails to intuit it? Nor do all prevail (to do so); and those who prevail to intuit, even that, which they intuit, they all are not, that is, they are not even just spirits themselves, as they can see and say, what a just spirit is. Wherefore can these be, except by inhering to the very same form, which they intuit, so that from this they be formed and be just spirits, not only discerning [cernentes] . . . And whence do these inhere to the form, except by loving (it)? . . . Therefore a man, who is believed (to be) just, is loved out of that form and truth, which the one, who loves, discerns and understands in himself; but that form and truth he is not, in whatever other manner it be loved. For neither do we find anything such beside that, so that, when it is unknown [incognita], by believing (in it) we love it, for the reason [ex eo] that we already know something such. For whatever such you would look at, it is; and it is not anything such, since it alone is such, as it itself is. Ibid., ch. 9, n. 13: However, that one must live in this manner, we believe (has been) heard from the ministers of God, and not from others, but we catch sight (of it) from within in ourselves, and/or rather from above ourselves in the truth itself. Therefore (St. Paul), whom we believe to have lived in this manner, out of this that we see, we love. And unless we would chiefly love this form, which we discern as always stable and incommutable, we would not, for that reason, love him, because his life, when he lived in the flesh, we hold by faith was completely adapted to and congruent with this form. Book IX, ch. 6, n. 9: We intuit the inviolable truth, from which we perfectly define, as much as we can, not of what kind the mind of any many whatsoever is, but of what kind it ought to be according to sempiternal reasons. Ibid., ch. 7, n. 12: Therefore, in that eternal truth, out of which all temporal things have been made, the form, according to which we are and according to which either in us and/or in bodies we work anything by true and right reason, we look upon with the sight of the mind, and from it we have a truthful, conceived, knowledge [notitiam], as a word in us, and by speaking we beget it within, nor does it depart from us by being born. ##6. Ultima haec verba aliam Augustinianae sententiae partem indicant, quam S. Bonav. in fine huius quaestionis attingit, scil. quod habitus animae, quicognoscuntur in ipsa veritate et per similitudines, quae idem sunt quod ipsae (i.e. habitus), non cognoscantur absque aliqua specie in intellectu cognoscentis formata. Libr. IX. c. 3. n. 3. ait: Mens ergo ipsa, sicut corporearum rerum notitias per sensus corporis colligit, sic incorporearum per semetipsam. Ergo et semetipsam per se ipsam novit, quoniam est incorporea. Ibid. c. 11. n. 16. loquendo de cognitione Dei ostendit, quod in ipsa fit aliqua Dei similitudo illa notitia, tamen inferior est, quia in inferiore natura est; creatura quippe animus, Creator autem Deus. Ex quo colligitur, quia cum se mens ipsa novit atque approbat, sic est eadem notitia verbum eius, ut ei sit par omnino et aequale atque identidem, quia neque inferioris essentiae notitata est, sicut corporis, neque superiors, sicut Dei. Et cum habeat notita similitudinem ad eam rem, quam novit, hoc est, cuius notitia est, haec habet perfectam etc. ##6. These last words indicate another part of the Augustinian teaching [sententiae], which St. Bonaventure touches upon at the end of this question, namely, that the habits of the soul, which are cognized in the truth itself and through similitudes, which are the same as themselves (i. e. habits), are not cognized without some species formed in the intellect of the one cognizing (them). In On the Trinity, Bk. IX, ch. 3, n. 3,

(St. Augustine) says: ¶ Therefore, the mind itself, just as it gathers knowledge [notitias] of corporeal things through the senses of the body, so (it gathers that) of incorporeals through itself. ¶ Therefore it also knows its very self through its very self, since it is incorporeal ¶ In ibid., ch. 11, n. 16:, speaking of the cognition of God, he shows, that in it ¶ there comes to be some similitude of God by that knowledge, however inferior it is, because it is in an inferior nature; the creature, indeed, the spirit, but the Creator, God. ¶ From which is gathered, that when the mind itself knows and approves itself, so there is by the same knowledge a word of it, such as is entirely on par with it and equal and identical [identidem], because neither is it knowledge of an inferior essence, as of the body, nor of a superior, as of God. ¶ And since it has by knowledge a similitude to that thing, which it knows, that is, to which the knowledge belongs, this (mind) has perfect (knowledge) ¶ etc.###The English translation here has been released to the public domain by its author. The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round () brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis#S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae#atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis#St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio#Cardinal Bishop of Alba#& Doctor of the Church##Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum#Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences##Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis#of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris##PRIMI LIBRI#BOOK ONE##COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVII.#COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVII##PARS I.¶PART I¶DUBIA CIRCA LITTERAM MAGISTRI.#DOUBTS ON THE TEXT OF MASTER PETER###Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 304-306.#Cum Notitiis Originalibus¶Latin text taken from Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 304-306.#Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.¶DUB. I.#DOUBT I##In parte ista sunt dubitationes circa litteram, et primo dubitatur de ista consequentia: ¶ Qui diligit proximum, consequens est, ut ipsam dilectionem diligat. ¶ Videtur enim ista consequentia non valere. ¶ Quamvis enim possibile sit, dilectionem diligi, non tamen est necesse, quod aliquis diligat eam; multa enim frequenter amamus, quae nollemus amare. #In this part are the doubts about the text (of Master Peter), and first there is the doubt concerning this consequence of (St. Augustine's reasoning): ¶ It follows that, he who loves (his) neighbor, loves chiefly that love. ¶ For this consequence of his does not seem to be valid. ¶ For although it is possible, that love be loved, it, however, is not necessary, that anyone love it; for we frequently love many (things), which we do not want to love. ##Item dubitatur de ista consequentia: ¶ Qui diligit dilectionem, consequens est, ut Deum diligat; quia, aut intelligit de increata, aut1 creata. ¶ Si de creata, nihil valet: ¶ diligit quid creatum, ergo increatum; si de increata, tunc in nullo concordat cum priori sententia, quia dilectio, qua diligimus2 proximum, est dilectio creata. #Likewise there is a doubt concerning this consequence of (the Saint's reasoning): ¶ It follows that he who loves love, loves God; because, either he understands (this) of uncreated (Love), or (of)1 created (love). ¶ If of created, it is not at all valid [nihil valet] (to say): ¶ ¶he loves something created, therefore (loves something) Uncreated; if of uncreated, then in no manner does this agree [concordat] with the prior sentence, that love, by which we love2 (our) neighbor, is created love. ##RESPONDEO: ¶ Dicendum, quod utraque consequentia bona est in proposito. ¶ Quidam enim est amor, in quo non est quietatio nec delectatio nec complacentia, ut puta ille qui est ex pronitate corruptionis, cui ratio obsistit. ¶ Quidam vero est amor, qui est cum delectatione, complacentia et quietatione; et in tali amore non est tantum acceptatio rei amatae, immo3 etiam ipsius amoris; et talis amor est caritas, et ideo sequitur: ¶ qui amat proximum amat dilectionem, id est, acceptat. #I RESPOND: ¶ It must be said, that each consequence is good in the proposed (argument). For there is a certain love [amor], in which there is not resting [quietatio] nor delectation nor complacence, as for example that which

is from the proneness of corruption, against which reason sits [obsistit].³ However, there is a certain love, which is with delectation, complacence and resting; and in such love there is not only acceptance of the thing loved, nay³ also of love itself; and such love is charity, and for that reason it follows: ⁴that he who loves [amat] (his) neighbor, loves love [dilectionem], that is, he accepts it [acceptat].##Sed quoniam bene sequitur:⁵ qui acceptat aliquid ex se, multo magis acceptat illud, in quo invenitur ratio acceptationis;⁴ si dilectio, eo ipso quo dilectio, acceptatur, maior dilectio magis acceptatur.⁵ Cum ergo dilectio nostra sit dilectio exemplata, et dilectio divina sit⁵ exemplar omnis rectae dilectionis, et in illa est prima et summa ratio omnis acceptationis:⁶ hinc est, quod sequitur, quod qui diligit dilectionem diligit Deum.⁶ Unde Augustinus⁶ arguit ex hac suppositione, quod ipsa caritas sive dilectio proximi est dilectio cum acceptatione, et ex hoc tenet prima consequentia;⁷ et ex alia suppositione, quod prima ratio acceptationis est in dilectione exemplante, non exemplata; et ex hoc patet secunda.⁸ But since it follows well:⁹ ¹⁰that he who accepts something out of himself, accepts much more that, in which there is found the reckoning of acceptance¹⁰; ⁴if love [dilectio], for the very (reason) by which (it is) love, is accepted, a greater love is more accepted.¹⁰ Therefore since our love is an exemplified love [dilection exemplata], and the Divine Love is⁵ the Exemplar of every upright love, and in That there is a first and most high reckoning of every acceptance:¹⁰ hence it is, that it follows, that he who loves [diligit] love, loves God.¹⁰ Whence (St.) Augustine⁶ argued from this supposition, that the very charity or love of neighbor is love with acceptance, and from this held the first consequence;⁷ and from the other supposition, that the first reckoning of acceptance is in the exemplifying love [dilectione exemplante], not the exemplified one; and from this is clear the second.⁸##DUB. II.#DOUBT II##Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit:¹⁰ Ecce iam potes notiorem Deum habere quam fratrem.¹⁰ Videtur enim falsum, quia primae ad Timotheum ultimo⁹ dicitur de Deo, quod lucem habitat inaccessibilem.¹⁰ Praeterea, de fratre novit, quid est, de Deo vero non novit, quid est, sed si est; ipse autem¹⁰ non loquitur quantum ad cognitionem, si est.#Likewise is asked of this which he says:¹⁰ Behold you already can have God more known than (your) brother.¹⁰ For it seems false, because in the last (chapter)⁹ of the First (Letter of St. Paul) to Timothy there is said of God, that He dwells in light inaccessible.¹⁰ Besides, one knows of (one's) brother, what he is, but of God one does not know, what He is, but whether He is; moreover¹⁰ he does not speak as much as regards the cognition of, whether he is.##RESPONDEO:¹⁰ Dicendum, quod aliquid magis certitudinaliter cognosci est dupliciter, quia certitudo cognitionis est secundum praesentiam; aliquid autem praesentius est dupliciter: aut quantum ad rationem cognoscibilis, aut quantum ad substantiam.¹¹ Quantum ad substantiam Deus est praesentior cuilibet rei quam aliqua alia res; quantum autem ad rationem cognoscendi hoc est dupliciter:¹⁰ aut a parte cognoscibilis, sicut sol est praesens caeco, et tamen caecus est absens lumini, sic Deus est praesentior quam frater; si autem a parte cognoscentis, sic praesentior est frater, quia praesens est oculis carnis,¹² quorum cognitio viget secundum statum praesentem.#I RESPOND: ¹⁰It must be said, that ¹⁰that something be cognized with greater certitude¹⁰ is in a twofold manner, because the certitude of cognition is according to presence; moreover something is more present in a twofold manner:¹⁰ either as much as regards the reckoning of a cognizable, or as much as regards (its) substance.¹¹ As much as regards substance God is more present to every thing than any other thing (is); but as much as regards reason for cognizing, this is in a twofold manner:¹⁰ either on the part of the cognizable, just as the Sun is present to the blind man, and yet the blind man is absent to the light, so God is more present than a brother; but if on the part of the one cognizing, thus the brother is more present, because he is present to the eyes of the flesh,¹² on which (things) cognition thrives [viget] according to the present state.##Aliter potest dici, quod praesentius est aliquid dupliciter in ratione cognoscibilis:¹⁰ vel secundum effectum, vel secundum se.¹⁰ Secundum se notior est frater, secundum effectum notior est Deus.¹⁰ Quia effectus divinus, qui est dilectio, intrat ipsam animam et ei est praesens et magis cognoscitur quam frater.¹³ In another manner it can be said, that something is more present in a twofold manner in the reckoning of a cognizable:¹⁰ either according to effect, and/or according to itself.¹⁰ According to itself a

brother is more known, according to effect God is more known. Because the divine effect, which is love [dilectio], enters the soul itself and is present to it and more cognized than the brother.13##DUB. III.#DOUBT III##Item quaeritur de illo verbo canonicae Ioannis quarto, quod est in littera: Qui diligit, manet in lumine. Videtur enim improprie dictum, quia lumen . . .#Likewise is asked of that (verse) in the fourth (chapter) of the Canonical (Letter of St.) John, which is in the text: He who loves, remains in the light. For it seems improperly said, that light . . .##1 Aliquid codd. ut H K aa ee ff cum ed. 1 repetunt hic de.2 Ex mss. et ed. 1 posuimus diligimus loco diligit. Paulo ante cod. 0, posito consequentia loco sententia, addit immo aequivocatur dilectio.3 Cod. dd sed pro immo.4 Sequimur nonnullos codd. ut F G H K T ponendo acceptationis loco dilectionis, quorum lectio toto contextus processu confirmatur. Mox aliqui mss. ut Y Z comparativo maior praemittunt particulam et, ac dein post magis multi codd. cum ed. 1 omittunt certe supplendum acceptatur.5 Lectio Vat., in qua habetur ut loco sit, castigatur ope mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6, ex quibus etiam paulo infra post hinc supplevimus est quod. Aliqui codd. ut A G H I K T etc. cum ed. 1 voci hinc praefigunt particulam et.6 Libr. VIII. de Trin. c. 8. n. 12, ex quo textus huius dubii sumtus est.7 Scil., quod qui diligit proximum, diligit ipsam dilectionem. 8 Plurimis codd. consentientibus, substituimus et ex hoc pro et ex hac.8 Nempe: quod qui diligit dilectionem, diligit Deum. 9 Ed. 1 ex hac loco ex hoc. 10 Plura de hac re vide supra q. 2. et apud B. Albert., hic a. 3. 11 S. Thom. et Petr. a Tar., hic expos. lit.9 Vers. 16, ubi Vulgata inhabitat loco habitat.10 Nonnulli codd. ut A I V X cum ed. 1 omittunt minus bene autem; cod. Y addit Magister.11 Vat. et cod. cc in hac propositione contra multos mss. et ed. 1 praesens loco praesentius, ac mox contra plurimos codd. et ed. 1, omisso primo aut, ponunt congoscibili loco cognoscibilis, quod transferunt post substantiam. Pro rationem cognoscibilis magis placeret rationem cognoscendi, si faverent codd. 12 Ex mss. et ed. 1 substituimus carnis pro carnis.13 De duplici modo, quo Deus intellectui nostro praesens est, vide supra d. 3. p. I. a. 1. q. 1. 14 In solutione huius dubii conveniunt B. Albert., hic a. 4. 15 Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 6. 16 Richard. a Med., hic a. 1. q. 3.##1 Some codices, such as H K aa ee and ff, together with edition 1 repete here of [de]. 2 From the manuscripts and edition 1 we have put we love [diligimus] in place of one loves [diligit]. A little before this codex 0, having put consequence [consequentia] in place of sentence [sententia], reads nay love is equivocated, because the [immo aequivocatur dilectionem quia] for that [quia].3 Codex dd has but [sed] for nay [immo].4 We follow not a few of the codices, such as F G H K and T, by putting acceptance [acceptationis] in place of love [dilectionis], the reading of which is confirmed by the entire progress of the context. Next some manuscripts, such as Y and Z, prefix to the comparative a greater [maior] the particle and [et], and then after more [magis] many codices together with edition 1 omit the certainly to be supplied is accepted [acceptatur].5 The reading of the Vatican edition, in which there is had and a divine love as [dilectio divina ut] in place of and the Divine Love is [dilectionem divina sit], is corrected with the help of the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3, and 6, from which we also a little below this after hence [hinc] supply the it is that [est quod]. Some codices, such as A G H I K T etc. together with edition 1 prefix to the word hence [hinc] the particle and [et].6 On the Trinity, Bk. VIII, ch. 8, n. 12, from which the text of this doubt has been taken.7 That is, that he who loves (his) neighbor, loves love itself. 8 (A little before this) with the agreement of very many codices, we have substituted and from this [et ex hoc] for and from this [et ex hac]. 9 Namely: that he who loves love, loves God. 10 Edition 1 has from this [ex hac] in place of from this [ex hoc]. [Trans. note: next the second refers to the second consequence.] 11 See more on this matter above in q. 2, and in Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 3. 12 St. Thomas and (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in the exposition of the text.9 Verse 16, where the Vulgate reads inhabits [inhabitat] in place of dwells [habitat].10 Not a few codices, such as A I V and X, together with edition 1, omit less well moreover [autem]; codex Y adds Master (Peter) [Magister]. [Trans. note: here he can rightfully refer either to Master Peter or St. Augustine since neither the latter and not hence the former, speak of the cognition of God's

existence.]]10 The Vatican edition and codex cc in this proposition, contrary to many manuscripts and edition 1, have present [praesens] in place of more present [praesentius], and next contrary to very many codices and to edition 1, having omitted the first either [aut] they read the reckoning for a cognizable [rationem cognoscibili] in place of a reckoning of the cognizable [cognoscibilis], which they transfer to after substance [substantia]. 0In place of a reckoning of the cognizable [rationem cognoscibilis] it would be more pleasing to have the reckoning of it being cognized [rationem cognoscendi], if the codices had favored it.120 From the manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted to the eyes of the flesh [oculis carnis] for to fleshy eyes [oculis carnis].130 On the twofold manner, by which God is present to our intellect, see above d. 3, p. I, a. 1, q. 1. 000 In the solution of this doubt agree Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 4. 000 (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 6.0 00 Richard of Middleton, here in a. 1, q. 3.###p. 305respicit cognitionem, sicut calor affectionem:0 ergo magis deberet dicere:0 manet in calore, quam mane in lumine.#respects cognition, just as warmth affection:0 therefore it ought rather to have been said:0 he remains in warmth, than he remains in the light.##RESPONDEO:0 Dicendum, quod luminis est manifestare.0 Manifestare autem aliquid alicui est dupliciter:0 aut sicut viam cognoscendorum, aut sicut viam agendorum.0 Primum est per scientiam, et contra illud lumen opponitur tenebra ignorantiae simplicis: secundum est per gratiam, unde:0 Unctio docebit vos de omnibus;1 et contra illud est tenebra malitiae sive peccati; et de hoc lumine et de his tenebris loquitur beatus Ioannes, quod patet in textu, et Ecclesiastici undecimo:20 Error et tenebrae peccatoribus concreata sunt.0 Et quoniam caritas semper est cum gratia, aliae virtutes non, ideo dicit:0 Qui amat, manet in lumine, per appropriationem.3#I RESPOND:0 It must be said, that it belongs to light to manifest.0 But 0to manifest something to someone0 is in a twofold manner:0 either just as the way of things to be cognized, or just as the way of things to be done.0 The first is through knowledge [scientia], and against that light is opposed the shadow [tenebra] of simple ignorance:0 the second is through grace, whence (there is written):0 (His) anointing will teach you concerning all (things);1 and against that is the shadow of malice or of sin; and of this light and of those shadows blessed John speaks, as is clear in the text, and in the eleventh (chapter) of Ecclesiasticus:20 Error and shadows have been created together for sinners.0 And since charity is always with grace, the other virtues not, for that reasons he says:0 He who loves, remains in the light, through appropriation.3##DUB. IV.#DOUBT IV##Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, quod in divinis donis nihil maius est caritate.0 Videtur enim dicere falsum, quia sapientiae donum ponitur excellentissimum inter omnia dona, vel si idem est caritas et sapientia, caritas non retinet praerogativam inter dona.0 Item quaeritur de consequentia:0 si caritas est praecipuum inter dona Dei, et nullum maius est quam Spiritus sanctus:0 ergo Spiritus sanctus est caritas.0 Aut ergo4 loquitur de caritate creata, aut increata; si de increata, tunc ergo probat idem per idem; si de creata, tunc nulla videtur consequentia, quia non valet, quodsi creata est caritas maior inter dona creata, quod sit Spiritus sanctus.#Likewise is asked of this which (Master Peter) says, that among divine gifts nothing is greater than charity.0 For it seems that he says (something) false, because the gift of wisdom is posited as the most excellent among all the gifts, and/or if charity and wisdom are the same, charity will not retain (its) prerogative among the gifts.0 Likewise there is asked of the consequence:0 if charity is chief among the gifts of God, and there is no one greater than the Holy Spirit:0 therefore the Holy Spirit is charity.0 Therefore4 either he speaks of created charity, or (of) uncreated (Charity); if of Uncreated, then, therefore, he proves the same through the same; if of created, then there seems to be no consequence, because it is not valid, that 0if created charity is greater among the created gifts, that it is the Holy Spirit0.##RESPONDEO:0 Dicendum, quod praedicta auctoritas Augustini potest intelligi de caritate creata et increata; et pro utraque habet veritatem.0 Si de increata, certum est; si de creata, maximum est inter dona, quia plus habet in se de ratione bonitatis sive de ipsa bonitate, quam aliquod donum,5 loquendo praecise.0 Quaedam enim dona sunt, quae sunt sine caritate; et hoc quidem certum est, quod minora sunt. 0Quaedam praesupponunt caritatem, sicut6 donum sapientiae.0 Caritas enim est,

quae dat sensum gustui, ut sapiant ei bona aeterna. Unde sapientia superaddit quandam ulteriorem habilitatem,⁷ quae comparata ad caritatem minus bonum est, sed prout claudit caritatem, maius bonum est ratione eius quod praesupponit. Et ita patet, quod caritas, praecise loquendo, est excellentissimum donum; sapientia vero, praesupponendo sive implicando donum caritatis, dicitur excellentissimum. #I RESPOND: It must be said, that the aforesaid authority of (St.) Augustine can be understood of created and Uncreated charity; and it is true [habet veritatem] for each. If of Uncreated, it is certain; if of created, it is greatest among the gifts, because it has more in itself of the reckoning of goodness or of goodness itself, than any gift,⁵ speaking precisely. For there are certain gifts, which are without charity; and this indeed is certain, that they are lesser. Certain ones presuppose charity, just as⁶ the gift of wisdom (does). For charity is, that which gives sense to taste, so that they taste eternal goods according to it (i.e. to charity). Whence wisdom adds above (this) a certain further ability,⁷ which compared to charity is a lesser good, but insofar as it encloses [claudit] charity, is a greater good by reason of that which it presupposes. And thus it is clear, that charity, precisely speaking, is the most excellent gift, but wisdom, by presupposing or implying the gift of charity, is said (to be) the most excellent one. ##Ad illud quod obiicitur de consequentia, dicendum, quod utroque modo bona est. Si enim intelligatur de caritate increata, si⁸ ipsa est donum primum et praecipuum, et Spiritus sanctus est huiusmodi: oportet quod ipsa sit Spiritus sanctus, quia quod per superabundantiam dicitur, uni soli convenit.⁹ Si autem de caritate creata; tunc consequentia Augustini intelligenda est a parte nominis sic: si caritas creata est maximum¹⁰ inter dona creata, et Spiritus sanctus est maximum donorum: ergo melius nominatur nomine doni excellentissimi quam alio. Consequens ergo est, ut Spiritus sanctus sit caritas, sed non creata, immo illa quae Deus est.¹¹ #To that which is objected concerning the consequence, it must be said, that in each manner it is good. For if it is understood of uncreated Charity, if⁸ #It is the first and chief gift, and the

Holy Spirit is of this kind: it is necessary [oportet] that it be the Holy Spirit, because what is said through a superabundance, convenes with one alone.⁹ But if of created charity, then the consequence (of St. Augustine) is to be understood on the part of the noun, in this manner: If created charity is the greatest (gift)¹⁰ among created gifts, and the Holy spirit is the greatest of gifts: therefore it is better named with the name of the most excellent Gift than with another. Therefore it follows, that the Holy Spirit is charity, but not the created one, nay that One which is God.¹¹ ##DUB. V. #DOUBT V##Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: Non utique sic dictum est, quod Dei substantia est nostra patientia. Videtur enim male dicere, quia caritas, qua nos diligimus Deum, non est ipse Deus, nisi intelligamus quo diligimus exemplariter vel causaliter: ergo cum similitudine sit de patientia, videtur quod Augustinus male destruit¹² illud simile. Item, cum Deus faciat nos diligentes, sicut patientes, quare non dicitur Deus caritas nostra, sicut patientia nostra? #Likewise is asked of this which he says: Not indeed in the same manner has it been said, that the Substance of God is our patience. For it seems that he speaks badly, because the charity, by which we love God, is not God Himself, unless we understand by which we love exemplarily and/or causally: therefore since it is similar concerning patience, it seems that (St.) Augustine badly destroys¹² that simile. Likewise, when God makes us loving, just as patient, for what reason is God said (to be) our charity, as (He is) our patience? ##RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod Deus est caritas et essentialiter et causaliter: essentialiter, quia in se amor est; causaliter, quia in nobis amorem efficit. Sed Deus non est patientia essentialiter, sed solum causaliter; et ideo Scriptura istum diversum modum innuens¹³ dicit, Deus esse patientiam nostram, et Deum esse caritatem sine additione. Ratio autem huius est, quia¹⁴ quidam habitus dicunt incompletionem, sicut patientia, spes et huiusmodi, qui non cadunt in Deo per essentiam, sed per causam, quia huiusmodi sunt a Deo. Quidem autem sunt habitus di- / -centes . . . #I RESPOND: It must be said, that God is charity both essentially and causally: essentially, because in Himself He is Love [amor]; causally, because in us He effects love. But God is not essentially patience, but only causally; and for that reason Scripture, hinting

at13 this diverse manner, says, that God is our patience, and that God is charity, without adding (anything more than that). Moreover the reason for this is, that14 certain habits mean incompleteness, just as patience, hope and (habits) of this kind (are), which do not occur in God through (His) Essence, but through (Him as their) Cause, because (those) of this kind are from God. Moreover, there are certain habits which / mean . . .###10 I. Ioan. 2, 27, ubi Vulgata: Unctio eius docet vos de omnibus. 000 Vat. contra mss. post unde addit per Ioannem.20 Vers. 16.30 Cfr. B. Albert., hic a. 6; S. Thom. et Petr. a Tar., hic in expos. textus.40 Ed. 1 enim loco ergo, quae et mox post aut repetit de caritate.50 Ed. 1 donorum, cod. dd autem addit aliud. 0Mox pauci codd. ut V Z omittunt quae sunt.60 Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 velut. Ed. 1 post sicut adiungit est.70 Exhibemus lectionem fere omnium mss. ponendo habilitatem pro virtutem quae habitat; ed. 1 habilitationem.0 Paulo infra ex multis codd. ut A G H I K T W etc. et ed. 1 pro minus bona substituimus minus bonum, quod et in se distinctius est et cum subnexis magis correspondens.80 Vat. sic loco si, et mox post huiusmodi addit ergo, sed obstat auctoritas mss. et ed. 1 et quidem bene, quia agitur tantum de consequentia ostendenda.90 Aristot., V. Top. c. 3. (c. 5.).100 Aliqui codd. ut I T addunt donum.110 Cfr. B. Albert., hic a. 7. 000 Petr. a Tar. et Richard., hic circa lit.120 Cod. T destruat; ed. 1 astruit.130 Mendum Vat. inveniens loco innuens correximus ope mss. 000 Textus S. Scripturae de isto diverso modo vide hic in lit. Magistri, c. 3.140 Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 substituimus quia loco quod et paulo infra qui pro quae.##10 1 Jn. 2:27, where the Vulgate reads:0 His anointing shall teach you concerning all (things). 000 The Vatican edition, contrary to the manuscripts, after whence (there is written) [unde] adds through (St.) John [per Ioannem].20 Verse 16.30 Cf. Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 6; St. Thomas and (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in the exposition of the text.40 Edition 1 has for [enim] in place of therefore [ergo], which also next after [in the English text, the second] either [aut] repeats of . . . Charity [de caritate].50 Edition 1 reads any of the gifts [aliquod donorum], but codex dd has any other gift [aliquod donum aliud]. 0Next a few codices, such as V and Z, omit which are [quae sunt]. 60 The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and in edition 1, reads as [velut]. 0Edition 1 after just as [sicut] adds is [est].70 We exhibit the reading of nearly all the manuscripts, by putting ability [habilitatem] for virtue, which dwells [virtutem quae habitat]; edition 1 enabling [habilitationem]. 0A little below this, from many codices, such as A G H I K T W etc. and edition 1, we have substituted a lesser good [minus bonum] for less good [minus bona], because the former is more distinct and corresponds more with what is subjoined.80 The Vatican edition has thus [sic] in place of if [sic], and next after of this kind [huiusmodi] it adds therefore [ergo], but the authority of the manuscripts and of edition 1 withstand this, and do so well, because it deals only with the consequence to be shown.90 Aristotle, Topics, Bk. V, ch. 3 (ch. 5).100 Some codices, such as I and T, add gift [donum].110 Cf. Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 7. 000 (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise and Richard of Middleton, here on the text.120 Codex T has the subjunctive form of destroys [destruat].; edition 1 reads builds up [astruit].130 The fault of the Vatican edition, of having finding [inveniens] in place of hinting at [innuens], we have corrected with the help of the manuscripts. 000 The text of Sacred Scripture on this diverse manner can be found here in the text of Master (Peter), ch. 3.140 From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted that [quia] for that [quod] and a little below this which (habits) [qui] for which (virtues) [quae].###p. 306di- / -centes complementum, et huiusmodi sunt in Deo essentialiter, sicut caritas et sapientia et huiusmodi.0 Notandum autem, quod Augustinus vult dicere, quod Deus est caritas essentialiter, sed ipse non vult dicere, quod sit caritas nostra essentialiter, sed causaliter et exemplariter.20 Quamvis enim omnes virtutes habeant exemplar cognoscitivum in Deo et omnes habeant exemplar secundum similitudinem longinquam, tamen quaedam virtutes non habent sibi correspondens in Deo per omnia, sicut patientia, quae duo dicit, scilicet passionem et superferri passionibus.0 Quantum ad primum, non habet in Deo correspondens, sed quantum ad secundum solum.0 Caritas autem habet amorem in Deo sibi per omnia correspondentem, et3 amorem non tantum essentialem, sed etiam personalem:0 et

ideo dicunt auctoritates,⁴ quod Spiritus sanctus est caritas, qua diligimus Deum; et ablativus qua dicit habitudinem non tantum causae efficientis, sed etiam formalis, non perficientis, sed exemplantis.⁵ #mean a complement, and (habits)1 of this kind are in God essentially, just as charity and wisdom and (those of) this kind are. But it must be noted, that (St.) Augustine wants to say, that God is charity essentially, but he does not want to say, that He is our charity essentially, but (rather) causally and exemplarily.² For although all virtues have (their) cognitive exemplar in God and all have an exemplar according to a distant similitude, yet certain virtues do not have in God one corresponding to themselves through all (things), just as patient, which means two (things), namely suffering and bearing up under sufferings. As much as regards the first, it does not have one corresponding in God, but only as much as regards the second. Moreover, charity has in God a corresponding Love [amorem] through all (things), and³ not only an essential Love, but also a personal One; and for that reason the authorities say,⁴ that the Holy Spirit is the Charity, by which we love God; and the ablative by which means the habitude not only of an efficient cause, but also of a formal one, not of a perfecting one, but of an exemplifying one.⁵ ##DUB. VI. #DOUBT VI##Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, quod solum donum caritatis dividit inter filios regni et filios perditionis. Videtur enim male dicere, quia aut loquitur de divisione quantum ad cognitionem, aut quantum ad veritatem. Si quantum ad veritatem, hoc falsum est, quia non solum in caritate, sed etiam in fide gratuita et spe differunt; si quantum ad cognitionem, tunc minime dividit, quia nescitur, quis hoc donum habeat. #Likewise is asked of this which he says, that the gift of charity alone divides between the sons of the Kingdom and the sons of perdition. For it seems that he speaks falsely, because either he speaks of a division as much as regards cognition, or as much as regards truth. If as much as regards truth, this is false, because not only in charity, but also in gratuitous faith and hope they differ; if as much as regards cognition, then least of all does it divide, because it is not known [nescitur], who has this gift. ##RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod omnia dona virtutum possunt esse informia praeter caritatem. Et quoniam possunt esse informia, possunt esse in iustis et peccatoribus, et ideo in illis nunquam separantur ab invicem. Sed caritas nunquam potest esse informis nec esse cum peccato, quia actus eius est diligere Deum⁶ propter se et super omnia, qui removetur per omne peccatum. Ideo dicit Augustinus,⁷ quod sola caritas distinguit, loquendo de distinctione in universalibus. #I RESPOND: It must be said, that all the gifts of the virtues can be formless [informia], except charity. And since they can be formless, they can be in the just and (in) sinners, and for that reason in these they are never separated from one another. But charity never can be formless nor be with sin, because its act is to love God⁶ for His own sake and above all (things), which is removed through every sin. For that reason (St.) Augustine says,⁷ that charity alone distinguishes (them), speaking of distinction in the universal. ##Quod obiicitur de fide gratuita sive formata, concedo, quod distinguit, sed tamen hoc non habet, quia fides, sed quia gratuita; et ita ex hoc, quod caritati coniuncta;⁸ et sic patet illud. #What is objected concerning gratuitous or formed faith, I concede, that it does distinguish, but yet it does not have this, because (it is) faith, but because (it is) gratuitous; and thus from this, that (it has been)⁸ conjoined to charity; and in this manner that (objection) is clear. ##DUB. VII. #DOUBT VII##Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: Si tradidero corpus meum, ita ut ardeam etc. Videtur enim male dicere, quia Dominus dicit, Ioannis decimo quinto:⁹ Maiorem hac dilectionem nemo habet, ut animam suam ponat etc.: ergo si hoc est maximum opus caritatis, impossibile est, quod fiat sine caritate. #Likewise is asked of this which (St. Paul) says: If I will hand my body over, thus that I burn etc.. For it seems that he speaks badly, because the Lord says, in the fifteenth (chapter of the Gospel of St.) John:⁹ A greater love than this no one has, to lay down his own life etc.: therefore if this is the greatest work of charity, it is impossible, that it be done without charity. ##RESPONDEO: Aliqui dicunt, quod Apostolus dicit per impossibile; posito enim adhuc,¹⁰ quod aliquis hanc poenam pateretur sine caritate pro Christo, adhuc non prodesset sibi. Credo tamen, quod aliqui ex industria naturalium et aliqua gratia gratis data possent sustinere pro fide

Christi mortem etiam sine caritate, sicut¹² haereticus sustinet per errorem. Et quod dicit Dominus, quod illud est summae caritatis, hoc dicit quantum ad signum et exteriorem ostensionem; signa tamen sunt fallibilia, et ideo non necessario oportet, quod si aliquis mortem sustinet pro Christo sive pro eius fide,¹³ habeat caritatem. Credo tamen, quod si aliquis pro Christo sustineret mortem, qui non magnum haberet obicem, quod disponderet se ad gratiae susceptionem, ita quod daretur sibi caritas. #I RESPOND: Some say, that the Apostle speaks by way of [per] the impossible; for with it posited still,¹⁰ that someone would suffer this punishment without charity for Christ's sake, still it would not profit him. Yet I believe, that some fall out of the industry of (their) natural (powers) and by some grace freely given could sustain death for the sake of faith in Christ [fide Christi] even without charity, just as¹² the heretic sustains (it) through error. And that the Lord says, that that belongs to most high charity, this He says as much as regards sign and exterior show [exteriorem ostensionem]; however signs are fallible, and for that reason it is not necessarily bound (to be), that if someone sustains death for Christ's sake or for the sake of his faith,¹³ he has charity. However, I do believe, that if anyone would suffer death for Christ's sake, who has no great obstacle [obicem], that he would dispose himself to take up the grace, such that charity would be given him. ###¹⁰ In cod. I additur habitus.²⁰ In Vat. haec propositio: Nec ita est patientia nostra exemplariter perperam deest, quae tamen in mss. et ed. 1 habetur.³⁰ Cod. V per loco et.⁴⁰ Quas videsis in lit. Magistri, hic c. 1-4.5 Duplex siquidem tunc distinguebatur causa formalis, scil. instrinseca seu informans (perficiens), et extrinseca seu exemplaris. De hoc dubio vide etiam B. Albert., hic a. 8 et Petr. a Tar., hic circa lit.6 Fide vetustiorum mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus male omissum Deum. Mox relativum qui referas ad actum. Plura de eo, quod caritas non possit esse informis, vide III. Sent. d. 27. a. 1. q. 4. 70 Libr. XV. de Trin. c. 18. n. 32, ex quo textus huius dubii sumtus est.⁸⁰ In ed. 1 additur est. Idem dubium solutum invenies apud B. Albert., hic a. 9.90 Vers. 13.100 Vat. perperam, et antiquioribus mss. cum edd. 1, 6 refragantibus, ad hoc. Dein edd. 2, 3 habens pro hanc.¹¹⁰ Ex pluribus codd. ut T X et ed. 1 adiecimus aliqui. Cod. Z aliquis, et paulo post posset loco possent; cod. Y absque aliquis habet posset.¹²⁰ Cod. bb addit particulam et. Mox cod. M pro errore, et cod. ee cum ed. 1 propter errorem loco per errorem.¹³⁰ Vat. cum aliquibus mss. hic repetit quod, in maiore parte codd. et ed. 1 tamen deest. ###¹⁰ In codex I there is added habits [habitus].²⁰ In the Vatican edition this proposition: Nor it He thus our patience exemplarily [Nec ita est patientia nostra exemplariter] is faultily lacking, which however is had in the manuscripts and edition 1.³⁰ Codex V has through [per] in place of and [et].⁴⁰ Which may be seed in the text of Master (Peter), here in chs. 1-4.5 Since a twofold formal cause was then distinguished, namely the intrinsic or informing (perfecting), and the extrinsic or exemplary one. On this doubt see also Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 8 and (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here about the text.60 Trusting in the older manuscripts and edition 1 we have inserted the badly omitted God [Deum]. Next the relative which [qui] refers to act [actum].⁷⁰ On the Trinity, Bk. XV, ch. 18, n. 32, from which the text of this doubt has been taken.⁸⁰ In edition 1 there is added it has been [est]. You will find the same doubt solved in Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 9.90 Verse 13.100 The Vatican edition faultily, and breaking with the more ancient manuscripts together with editions 1 and 6, has in this case [ad hoc] for still [adhuc]. Then editions 2 and 3 read someone having punishment would suffer etc. [aliquis habens poenam pateretur etc.].¹¹⁰ From very many codices, such as T and X and edition 1, we have inserted some [aliqui]. Codex Z has someone [aliquis], and a little after this has the singular form for could [posset]; codex Y without someone [aliquis] has the singular form of the verb [and thus one must be inferred for someone].¹²⁰ Codex bb adds the particle even [etiam]. Next codex M has for the sake of error [pro errore], and codex ee together with edition 1 has for the sake of error [propter errorem] in place of through error [per errorem].¹³⁰ The Vatican edition, together with some manuscriptsn here repeats that [quod], which however in the greater part of the codices and in edition 1 is lacking. ### The English translation here has been released to the public domain by its author. The / symbol is used to indicate

```
Items#####0###1###E###F###Y###Z###[###v####0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0##  
#0####0#### ##    ###    ###    ##.   ##/   #0   ##K   ##0   ##0   ##0  
      ##0   ###
```

```
#####
##00Y0t0000n000n0000000000t0ctcc00####
```

```
#####0#0#6##0####0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###030#####40#
#####a0###0T##    ##$##$If####a##M##kd#####$##$If#####T###00###0
##+##C          #####C
```

```
#####0#0##6###0####0###0####0###0####0###0####0###030####0#40#
#####a0###0T##   $$$If####a$   $$$If####a$####0###0###0####0####   ###
      ##   ##/   ##0
```

```
#######Z#####M##kd###$##
$#If####T###00###
##+##C          #####C
```

```
#####0#0#6###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###030####[]#40#
#####a0###0T###M##kd0####$##$If#####T###00###0
##+##C#####C
```

```
#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####[#40#  
#####a0###0I##   ##$##$If####a$###0    ##0    ###  
###  
###  
##$  
##&  
## -  
##.
```

```
#####  
#####S#####M#kd###$##$If####T###  
0###  
##+##C          #####C
```

```
#####0#0#6###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###030####[]#40#
#####a0###0T###M##kdL####$##$If#####T###00###0
##+##C#####C
```

```
#####0#0##6##0###0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030####[]#40#
#####a0###0|#####$##0###0###$#If####[$#\#$a$####
###
###
###
##
```

##!

##\$
##&
##'
##*
##+
##,
##-
##.
##5
##6
##8
##9
##{
##|

#h050##h07/#CJ0#0J##QJ##^J##aJ0##
#h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ#####h050##h07/#6#0J##QJ##]#0^J#####h050##h07/
#CJ##0J##QJ##^J###'#h050##h07/#5#0B*#0J##QJ##\#0^J##ph##0#!#h050##h07/
#B*#0J##QJ##^J##ph##0#/#h050##h07/#5#0B*#CJ##0J##QJ##\
#0^J##aJ##ph##0#)#h050##h07/#B*#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##aJ##ph##0###h050##h07/
#0J##QJ##^J#####h050##h07/#5#0J##QJ##\#0^J###.
##6
##8
##|

##C

#####\$##\$If####[\$#\\\$a\$##M##kd####\$##\$If#####T###00###
##+##C#####C

#####6#####3#####4#
#####a#####\$If####[\$#\\\$a\$####\$If#####a#####

##C

##D

[illegible]


```

:##0:##m:##s:##0:###;##3;##0;##0;##0;###<###<###<##!
<##~<##0<##0<##0<##0<##0<##0<##0<##0<###=##

```


#SH

```
##"#h050##h07/#6#0CJ##0J##QJ##]#0^J#####h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##/  
T>##U>##V>##\>## ]>##0>##0>###?##Q?##R?##T?##g?##y?##0?  
###G###G###G###l@##7@##A@##0@###A##3A##4A##QA##bA##0A##0A##0A##0A##0A##B##0B  
##0B##0B##0B###C##0q0000000□0□0000□0□0000□0n0`000000□0####h050##h07/  
#>*#0J##QJ##^J##  
#h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ#####h050##h07/#6#00J##QJ##]#0^J###!#h050##h07/  
#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J### #h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##mH #sH  
##,#h050##h07/#5#06#00J##QJ##\#0]#0^J##mH#sH  
##(#h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ##mH #sH  
##)#j{####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##U##^J##mH #sH ##  
%V>##]>##0A##uE##vE##0E##0E##0E##0E##0E##0F##0#####0#####0#####  
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
##0#####  
#####  
#####  
###$#$#I f####a$#M##kd#####$#$I f####T###00###0  
##+##C #####C
```

[illegible]


```
y##y###y##000[]000o[00K00#####h050##h07/
#5#00J##QJ##\#0^J###' #h050##h07/#5#0B*#0J##QJ##\#0^J##ph##0#!#h050##h07/
#B*#0J##QJ##^J##ph##0#+#h050##h07/#5#0B*#CJ##0J##QJ##\#0^J##ph##0)#h050##h07/
#B*#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##aJ##ph##0###h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J###
#h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J###
#h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##mH   #sH   ##,#h050##h07/#5#06#00J##QJ##\#0]#0^J##mH #sH
    ##0x##0x##0x###y###y##
y###y##0y##0y##0y##&z##0#####0#####0#####Z#####0###
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####
M##kdH
###$##$If#####T###00###0
##+##C      #####C
#####0#0##6##0####0###0####0####0####0####0####0####0####0####030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T##   ###$##$If####a$##M##kd0       ###$##$If#####T###00###0
##+##C      #####C
#####0#0##6##0####0###0####0####0####0####0####0####0####0####0####030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T##
#y##0y##0y##0y##0y##0y##0y###z##$z##%z##&z##' z###{###{##           {###|###|###|
##N|##0|
###}##J}##K}###~##a~##b~###□##d□##l□##0□##0□###0###0##J0##K0##L0##S0##T0###0##00
##00##00##0###0###
0###0##j##`##0###0###0###0##00##00##00##00##□##
□###0###0###0###0###0###0###0000000000x000000000000000000000000000000000!
#h050##h07/#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J####h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J####h050##h07/
#5#00J##QJ##\#0^J###
#h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J####h050##h07/
#6#00J##QJ##]#0^J##@&z##' z##K}-##K0##L0##`###0##0#####0#####0#####
#####Z#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####
#####M##kd0
###$##$If#####T###00###0
##+##C      #####C
#####0#0##6##0####0###0####0####0####0####0####0####0####0####0####030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T##   ###$##$If####a$##M##kd0
###$##$If#####T###00###0
##+##C      #####C
#####0#0##6##0####0###0####0####0####0####0####0####0####0####0####030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T#####0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###P0##Q0###0###0###0###0###c##η#
#Nj##0###0###0##60##70##80##f0##00##00##00##0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###
0##Y0##Z0###0###0##+0## ,###0###0###00##00##00##00##0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###T0##~0##□0
##00##0###0##a0##c0###0###0##000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000
000000#####h050##h07/#>.*#0J##QJ##^J####h050##h07/#6#00J##QJ##]#0^J###!
#h050##h07/#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J##
#h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J####h050##h07/
#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##@#0###0###0###0###0###0###T0##0#####0#####0#####
#####Z#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####
#####M##kd0#####$##$If#####T###00###0
##+##C      #####C
#####0#0##6##0####0###0####0####0####0####0####0####0####0####0####030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T##   ###$##$If####a$##M##kdA#####$##$If#####T###00###0
##+##C      #####C
#####0#0##6##0####0###0####0####0####0####0####0####0####0####0####030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T#####0##~0##00##00##0###0##S0##T0##U0##V0##W0##X0##h0##z0##00##00#
#00##Û##0##0##0###0##
```

0##0###0##?

0##E0##F0##G0##H0##v0##}0##00##00##00##0##0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###000000ô0000

|0|0|0m0000|00|00|00|00#####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##aJ###"#h050##h07/

#6#0CJ##0J##QJ##]#0^J###%#h050##h07/#5#0CJ##H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J##%#j:

[illegible]

##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T####:0##;0##00####0###0##=0##00##0#####0#####0#####
####Z#####0#####0#####0#####0#####
#####M##kd#####\$#\$If####T###00###0
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T## \$\$\$If####a\$##M##kd0#####\$#\$If####T###00###0
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T#####0##

0##00##00###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0##<0##=0###0##i0##j0##00##00##00###0##
%0##&0##00##00##00###0##

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0####0#0####0####0#0####0###030#####[]#40#
#####a0###0T####0
##0
##0
##0
##0
##0
##0
#####S###X###0###0###0###0####

###

##@

##A

##B

##C

#####


```
#####0#0#0#6##0###0###0#0###0###0#0###0###0#0###0###030#####[40#
#####a0###0T##   ##$##$If####a$##   $"##
%"##&"##}"##~"##[##0"##0"##0"##0"##0"#####!
```


###0###0###0#####Z###[###0###00000000000000000000q000q0000000000###h050##h07
/#6#00J##QJ##]#0^J#####h050##h07/#>*#0J##QJ##^J##!#h050##h07/#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\
#0^J####h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J###
#h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ#####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J#####h050##h07/
#5#00J##QJ##\#0^J###"#h050##h07/#5#0CJ##0J##QJ##\#0^J###
#h050##h07/#CJ\$#0J##QJ##^J##aJ\$,0##0##0#####

#####Z#####

###M##kd?###\$#\$If#####T###0###
##+##C #####C

#####6#####03#####4#
#####a###T## \$\$\$If####a\$##M##kd[?###\$#\$If#####T###0###
##+##C #####C

#####6#####03#####4#
#####a###T####0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###
#####0###
#-###.###S###c###h###u###0###0###

#####h50##h07/#6#0J##QJ##]#^J####h0
50##h07/#>#*0J##QJ##^J##!#h050##h07/#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\#^J####h050##h07/
#0J##QJ##^J####h050##h07/#5#00J##QJ##\#^J###"h050##h07/#5#0CJ##0J##QJ##\
#^J### #h050##h07/#CJ #0J##QJ##^J##aJ ####h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J###
#h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ##,#####.###y#####
#####Z#####
#####M##kdT@###\$#\$If#####T###
00###
##+##C #####C

#####6#####03#####4#
#####a###T## \$\$\$If####a\$##M##kd#@###\$#\$If#####T###0###
##+##C #####C

#####6#####03#####4#
#####a###T#####
##B
##C

#####x###y###z###

##=

##>

##U

##V

#####j##k##l##m##n##o##0##0##0##0##0##0#####(###)###*#####
###S###e#####000000000000000000000000}00k0k000k0k0k00"#h050##h07/
#6#0CJ##0J##QJ##]#0^J#####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##aJ###%#h050##h07/
#5#0CJ##H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J###%#jMA###h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##U##^J#####h050##h07/
#CJ##0J##QJ##^J### #h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ###!#h050##h07/#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\
#0^J####h050##h07/#6#0J##QJ##]#0^J#####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##*y###z###V

##k##l##n##
##)###8###^########Z#####T#####T
#####T#####T#####T#####\$If#####M##kd
@###\$##\$If#####T###00###
##+##C #####C

#####6#####03#####4#
#####a###T## \$\$\$If####a\$##M##kd@###\$##\$If#####T###00###
##+##C #####C

#####6#####03#####4#
#####a###T##

####*###/###6###7###8###9###A###D###J###N###]###^###_#####c###i###p###u###

#####+########X###l###
e00000e000000000Y0|00000e00000000#####h050##h07/
#>*#CJ##0J##QJ##^J####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##aJ###%#j0A###h050##h07/
#CJ##0J##QJ##U##^J##
#h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ###%#h050##h07/#5#0CJ##H*#0J##QJ##\
#0^J####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J####h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J###"h050##h07/
#6#0CJ##0J##QJ##]#0^J##0^###0###0###
###0###0###0###


```
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####
###0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####
##0#####
#####
#####$#$If####a$####$#0##\
$a$#####$a$##M##kd0B####$#$If####T###00###0
##+##C#####C
```

```
#####0#0##6###0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030####[]#40#
#####a0###0T#####$#If#####
```

#####S###|

#####

#####0###000000e00000e000000tJL0### #h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##mH
#sH ##,#h050##h07/#5#06#00J##QJ##\#0]#0^J##mH#sH
##(#h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ##mH #sH
##)#j0B###h050##h07/#0J##QJ##U##^J##mH #sH #
#h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ#####h050##h07/#>*#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##%#h050##h07/
#5#0CJ##H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J###"#h050##h07/
#6#0CJ##0J##QJ##]#0^J####h050##h07/
#CJ##0J##QJ##^J###0###0###0#####0###0#####5###:###@###D###J#
##N###0###0#####

[illegible]

##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0####0#0####0####0#0####0####030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T## \$\$\$If####a\$##M##kd#0###\$\$\$If####T###00###0
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0####0#0####0####0#0####0####030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T#####j##!j##0j##0j##0j###k###k##

k###k###k##Xk##ck##ek##0k##0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0##
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####
\$\$\$If####a\$##M##kd00###\$\$\$If####T###00###0
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0####0#0####0####0#0####0####030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T#####\$##0###0###\$If####[\$#\a\$####0###0###\$If####[\$#\a\$##\
j##hj##0j##0j##0j##0j##0j##0j###k###k###k###k##
k###k###k###k###k##Wk##Xk##bk##ck##dk##ek##0k##0k##0k##0k##0k##0k##0k##\##
l###l##

Q###\$##\$#If#####T###00###
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####40#
#####a0###0T## \$\$\$#If####a\$##M##kd0P###\$##\$If#####T###00###
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####40#
#####a0###0T####er##fr###s##0s##0s##vt##cu##0#####0#####
####Z#####0#####0#####
#####M##kd0Q###\$##\$If#####T###00###
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####40#
#####a0###0T## \$\$\$#If####a\$##M##kd_Q###\$##\$If#####T###00###
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####40#
#####a0###0T#####t##5t##6t##ut##vt###u###u##
u##bu##cu##du##eu##ju##ku##0u##0u##0u##0u##0u##0u##0u##v## v##
v##7v##8v##:v##rv##0v##0v##0v##w## w##
w##

0##
0###0###0##E##3##\$##0#####0#####0#####Z#####Q#####
#####Q#####Q#####Q#####Q#####
###\$##\$If####a\$##M##kd0V###\$##\$If####T###00###0
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0#####0###0#####0###0#####0###0#####0###030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T## ###\$##\$If####a\$##M##kd0U###\$##\$If####T###00###0
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0#####0###0#####0###0#####0###0#####0###030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T### c0##d0##00##00###0###0###0##v0##00##00##00###0###0##

#SH


```
0###0##q0##s0##u0##00##00##0#####0####0#####0#####0#####0#  
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0##  
#####  
#####$##0###0###$If####[$#\ $a$a####0###0###$If####[$\  
$M##kdjb###$$If#####T###00###0  
##+##C #####C
```

```
#####If####a#####0##*0###J0##V0##p0##q0##s0##u0#####0####0####0####  
0###0###0###0##L0##M0##W0##X0##Y0##Z0###0####0####0####0####0####0####0####0####0  
000900000000y00000y0hv00yh###" h050##h07/#5#CJ##0J##QJ##\#0^j###  
#h050##h07/#CJ$#OJ##QJ##^j##aJ$##  
#h050##h07/#OJ##PJ##QJ##^j##aJ#####h050##h07/#6#0J##QJ##]#0^j#####h050##h07/  
#5#0J##QJ##\#0^j#####h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J#####h050##h07/  
#OJ##QJ##^J###(#h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##aJ##mH##sH##  
#h050##h07/#CJ##OJ##QJ##^j##aJ####&#h050##h07/#5#CJ##0J##QJ##\#0^j##aJ##!  
00##00###0###0##M0##X0##Z0##00###0####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
#####0#####0#####0#####Z#####Q#####  
##      ##$##$If####a###M##kd#c#####$##I f#####T###00###0  
##-##C          #####C
```

```
#####0#0##6##0#####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####40#
#####a0####0T###
```

```
00###0###0###0##f0##g0##h0##00##00##00##00##00##00##00###0##'0##40##d0##e0##
#0##00##00##00##00##00###0###0###0##*0##10##00##00##00##)0##*0###0##00##00##00##
00##00##00##00##00###0###0###0###0###!0##"0###0##-
0##40##^0## 0##p0##z0###00000ωωèωωè000ωωèωωè000ωω0ωωèωωèωω###!h050##h07/
#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J#####h050##h07/#6#00J##QJ##J#0^J#####h050##h07/
#CJ##0J##QJ##^J###
h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ#####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J#####h050##h07/
#5#00J##QJ##\#0^J###"h050##h07/#5#0CJ##0J##QJ##\
#0^J##800##g0##h0##00##00##00##<0##00##0#####0#####0#####0##
#####Z#####0#####0#####0#####0#####
#####M##kd0c###$##$If#####T###00###0
##+##C #####C
```

```
#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030####[]#40#
#####a0###0T##
```

```
#####If####a$###z0##00##00###0###0###0##j0##k0###0###0###0##;0##<0##00##00##0
0##00##00##00##00##00##00##00###0###0##*0##50##60##70##G0##W0##00##00###0###
0###0##s0##t0###0###00##00##00###00###00###00###00###00###0##
```

```
Q##0000000000000000000000000000000000000000~00###%#h050##h07/#5@CJ##H*#OJ##  
QJ#\#@^J##%#j\d####h050##h07/#CJ##OJ##QJ##U##^J#####h050##h07/  
#CJ##OJ##QJ##^J#####h050##h07/#>.*#OJ##QJ##^J##  
#h050##h07/#OJ##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ#####h050##h07/#6#0OJ##QJ##]#@^J###!#h050##h07/  
#5#0H*#OJ##QJ##\#@^J####h050##h07/#OJ##QJ##^J##100##00##00##;0##  
0##00##c0##00##00##00##00##00##$0##30##00##f0##00##00##00#####0#####  
#0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####
```


[illegible]

#^J####h050##h07/#6#00J##QJ##]#^J####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J###
#h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ##3S0##T0##00##0####0####0####R###]###_###0#####
#####0#####0#####Z#####Q#####Q#####Q#####
####Q#####Q#####
###\$##\$If####a\$##M##kd0g###\$##\$If####T###00###0
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0####0#0####0####0#0####0####030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T## ###\$##\$If####a\$##M##kd0g###\$##\$If####T###00###0
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0####0#0####0####0#0####0####030#####□#40#
#####a0###0T### _###D###E#####0 ##0 ##m

#####Q#####
#####M##kdh###\$##\$If####T
###0###
##+##C #####C

#####6#####3#####4#
#####a###T## \$\$\$If####a##M##kd4h###\$##\$If####T###0###
##+##C #####C

#####6#####3#####4#
#####a###T##

###\$##\$If####a###E###F###N###0#####t##v
###x###&###'##### ,###-
###0##### ##0 ##

##1
##;
##A
##C
##R
##Y
#####h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##
#h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ###!#h050##h07/#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\#^J####h050##h07/
#6#0J##QJ##]#^J#####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J#####h050##h07/#5#0J##QJ##\
#^J###"#h050##h07/#5#0CJ##0J##QJ##\#^J### #h050##h07/#CJ\$#0J##QJ##^J##aJ\$#2Y
#####\$###C###K###i###q###s########

###

##\$

##=

##G

##l

##m

##0

##0

##0

##0

#####*###^###g###|###}###@###@###@###@#####
#####

###'###(###0###0#### ##Q ##R ##z ##{ ##0 ##0 ###!##0!##0!##0!##0!##0!##0!##0!
##0!
###"##*"##6"##G"##T"##0"##0"##0"#####0###0###000□□□□0□0'0□'0□0z0z000□□□□##h
050##h07/#5#00J##QJ##\#0^J###!#h050##h07/#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J####h050##h07/
#CJ##0J##QJ##^J###
#h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ#####h050##h07/#6#00J##QJ##]#0^J#####h050##h07/
#0J##QJ##^J###,#h050##h07/#5#06#00J##QJ##\#0]#0^J##mH#sH ##
#h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##mH #sH #0####

###R ##!##!##!##!
#####Z#####Q#####Q#####

###\$\$\$If####a##M##kd0k###\$\$\$If####T###00###
##+##C #####C

#####6#####03#####4#
#####a0###T## ###\$\$\$If####a##M##kdfk###\$\$\$If####T###00###
##+##C #####C

#####6#####03#####4#
#####a0###T#####!##!##4-
##x;##y;###J##[#######Z#####

#####M##kd_l###\$\$\$If####T###00###
##+##C #####C

#####6#####03#####4#
#####a0###T## ###\$\$\$If####a##M##kd

[illegible]

```
<##*><#0<#<#0<#<#0<#<#0<###=####=#S==#[#####?##y?##~?  
#####A###B###UB###C###KC## ] C###D###E##E##E###F###F###F###2F###9F###TF## [ F##kF  
##tF###G###H###I##0I##0I###J###J###J###J##0J##0J###K###kK##yK###L###L###L##0L##0L  
##0L##0L###M##0000000000j0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000  
0000#####h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J###  
h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ#####h050##h07/>*#0J##QJ##^J####h050##h07/  
#0J##QJ##^J#####h050##h07/  
#6#0J##QJ##] #0^J##G#M###N##0N##0N###0###P###Q###R##dR##0R###S##0S##0S###T###U##  
#V##' V##4V##0V##0V###W###W##  
W##5W##<W##DW##NW##0W##0W###X###Y##9Y##HY###Z###[ ##Z[ ##b[ ##0[ ##0[ ##0[ ##0[ ##0[ ##0  
[ ##0[ ##0[ ##0[ ##0[ ###\##! \##5\  
##0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000j00000}#" h050##h07/  
#6#0CJ##0J##QJ##] #0^J###%#h050##h07/#5#0CJ##H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J##  
%#jm###h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##U##^J####h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J###  
h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##aJ#####h050##h07/>*#0J##QJ##^J#####h050##h07/  
#6#0OJ##QJ##] #0^J#####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##10[ ##0[ ##0[ ##7\  
##8][ ##:] ][ ##_ _##_ _##_#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
#####0#####0#####0#####T#####0#####$a$##M##kd  
In###$#$If#####T##00###0  
#+##C #####C
```

[illegible][illegible]

```
#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030####[]40##  
#####a0###0T####'0##B0##00##00##00##0###0###0###0###&0##'0##R0##S0##[]0##00##0  
0##00##00##00##00##00##00##00##00000J000000v0f0PqPa00#####h050##h07/  
#0J##QJ##^J##aJ##0*##h050##h07/#5#0B*#0J##QJ##\0^J##phwww#0*####h050##h07/  
#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##0*#' #h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##mH##sH##0*####h050##h07/  
#CJ##OJ##QJ##^J##0*####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##mH##sH##0*####h050##h07/  
#0J##QJ##^J##0*####h050##h07/#CJ##OJ##QJ##^J#####h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J###!  
#h050##h07/#6#0OJ##QJ##]#0^J##0*#,h050##h07/  
#B*#CJ##OJ##QJ##^J##aJ##ph##0#0*##'0##00##0##h##0##&0##'0##S0##00##0#####  
#0#####0#####0#####0#####Q#####0#####0  
#####M##kd0r###$##$If#####T###00###0  
##+##C #####C
```

```
#####0#0##6###0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030####[]#40#
#####a0###0T##   ###$##$If####a###00##00##00##00##00##00##
ق##0#####0#####0#####Z#####Q#####Q#####
#####
#####$##$If####a###M###kdqs###$##$If####T###00###0
##+##C   #####C
```

```
#####0#0##6##0####0###0####0###0####0###0####0###030####0#40#
#####a0###0T####00##ج##v##□##0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0##
0###0###00##10##20##30##40##00###00###00###00###00###00###00###00###!###0###0###0###0###0
###0###0###00□□00□□0000◆0s◆s0ss◆0a#####h050##h07/
#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##aJ##0*###h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##aJ##0*##)h050##h07/
#5#0CJ##0J##QJ##\#0^J##aJ##0*###h050##h07/#0J##PJ##QJ##^J##0*###h050##h07/
#0J##QJ##^J##aJ##0*#!h050##h07/#5#00J##QJ##\#0^J##0*###h050##h07/
#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##0*###h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##0*##,h050##h07/
#B*#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##aJ##ph##0#0*#$1  1#0###0###0###0###0### 0#0#####0###
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####M##kd#t###$##$If#####T###00###
0
##+##C #####C
```

```
#####0#0#6###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###030####[]40#
#####a0###0T###10##20##40###00###00###00###0###0###0###0###0#####0
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####T#####
#####M##kd0t###$##$#I f#####T###00###0
##+##C#####C
```

```
#####0#0##6###0####0###0####0####0####0####0####030#####□#40#  
#####a0###0T#####0##!0#####$0###%0##*0##+0##,0##-  
0##.0##00##\#####00###00###00####0##$0##i0####0##L0##M0##N0##t0###00##T##á##ÿ##□##l_  
#[]#0##0####0##&0##.0##z0##{0##00###00###0####0##E0##N0##^0####00000"ك0000ك0000"  
00000000000000000000t000000###' #h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##aJ##mH##sH##0*$#$h050##h07/  
#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J##0*##!#h050##h07/#6#0QJ##QJ##]0^J##0*###h050##h07/  
#0J##QJ##^J##0*###h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##0*###h050##h07/  
#0J##QJ##^J##aJ##0*###h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##aJ##0*%#h050##h07/  
#5#0CJ##0J##QJ##\#0^J##0*##-#0##$0##,0##-  
0##00##M0##N0##00###00###0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
#####Q#####0#####0#####0#####M##kdcu##  
$#$I f#####T###0####0  
##+##C #####C
```

```
#####0#0#6#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####40#
#####a0###0T##
```

###\$##\$#If####a\$###^_##w##~########h##i#####
#####k##l##m##v#####3##4#####e##f#####
#:##;#####S##T#####"#####
#####'h5##h7/#0J##QJ##^J##aJ##mH

#SH

```
#####0#0##6###0####0###0####0###0####0###0####0###030#####4#  
#####a####T##    ##$##$If####a##M##kdou###$##$If#####T###00###  
##+##C      #####C
```

```
#####0#0##6###0####0###0####0###0####0###0####0###030#####40#  
#####a0###0T##    ##$##$If####a$##M##kd\v###$##$If#####T###00###0  
##-##C      #####C
```


#####V##]##d##e##f##g##p#####(##>##0##Z##[##]##j##u
#####X#####|#####p##s#####-
##0#####4##=##>##@##U##^#####
#####%#h050##h07/#5#0CJ##0J##QJ##\
#0^J##0*###h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##aJ##0*###h050##h07/
#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##0*###h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##aJ##0*##\$#h050##h07/#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\
#0^J##0*##!#h050##h07/#6#0J##QJ##]#0^J##0*###h050##h07/
#0J##QJ##^J##0*##5e0##f0##0##X0##Y0#####
#####Z#####
#####M##kdUw###\$##\$If#####T###0###
##+##C#####C

#####6#####3#####4#
#####a#####T## \$##\$If####a\$##M##kd#w###\$##\$If#####T###0###
##+##C#####C

#####6#####3#####4#
#####a#####T#####
#####W##X##Y##_#####

#####8##>##N##T##{#####!
#####t#####
%#h050##h07/#5#0CJ##0J##QJ##\#0^J##0*###h050##h07/
#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##aJ##0*#'h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##aJ##mH

#SH

#SH

0##0###0##00##00000ı00000ı0000

□000000000000000000000000ı0#####h050##h07/
#0J##QJ##^J##mH##sH##0*###h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##mH

SH

0*#(#h050##h07/#5#0CJ##H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J##0*####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##mH

#SH

#SH

#SH

```
#0*#s$h050##h07/#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J##0*#####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##0*#!  
#h050##h07/#6#00J##QJ##]#0^J##0*##-  
00##00##00##00##00##00##00###0###0###0###0###90##A0##~0##00##00##00##00##00##00##00##  
e0##g0##|  
0##00###0##v0##w0##x0##y0##z0##{0##0##00'000000000000000000000000u0`0#####  
#####(h050##h07/#5#0CJ##H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J##0*##  
%#j0}###h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##U##^J####h050##h07/  
#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##0*#$h050##h07/#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J##0*##!h050##h07/  
#6#00J##QJ##]#0^J##0*###h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##0*%#h050##h07/#5#0CJ##0J##QJ##\  
#0^J##0*###h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##aJ##0*###h050##h07/  
#0J##QJ##^J##aJ##0*###w0##x0##z0##0##0##J###0###0###0###E###0#####)###u###0###  
###[]###0###e###r###0#####0#####0#####0#####  
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
###0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
#0#####0#####0#####0#####$If####M##kdr}###$##$If####T##  
#00###0  
##+##C          #####C
```


#SH

SH

0*#(#h050##h07/#5#0CJ##H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J##0*####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##mH

#SH


```
#####f###0####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
##    ##$##$If####a#####$a$#####$a$##M##kd    □####$##$If####T###00###0  
##+##C          #####C
```

```
##1
##?
##?
##?
##?
##?
##?
##?
##?
##?
##?
##?
```

#####g###h###j########

###

###

##%

##0

##0

##0

SH

0*###h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##mH

#SH

#0*###h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##mH##sH##0*#(#h050##h07/#5#0CJ##H*#0J##QJ##\
#0^J##0*##'#h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##aJ##mH##sH##0*###h050##h07/
#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##0*#%#h050##h07/
#6#0CJ##0J##QJ##]#0^J##0*##1#*##0*##0+##0+##4,##A,##0,##@-##0-##
.##

```
.##; .###/##;/##0/  
##00#####1##□1##2###2##&3##T4##15##05##0#####0#####0#####0##  
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0####  
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
#####$If#####0,##0,##0,##0,##0,##0,##0,  
##0,##0,###-###-##-###-###-##*-##1-##8-##>-##?-##@-##B-##]-##_-##m-##w-##0-##0-  
##0-##0-##0-##0-##0-##0-##0-###.## .##  
.###.##
```

.##.##).##/.##:##;##<##h.##0.###/###/##0010000000000000001000000000
000 000000000000#####%#j80###h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##U##^J####h050##h07/
#0J##QJ##^J##aJ##0*###h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##mH##sH##0*#(#h050##h07/
#5#0CJ##H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J##0*####h050##h07/#0J##QJ##^J##mH

#SH

#0*###h050##h07/#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##0*%h050##h07/#6#0CJ##0J##QJ##]#0^J##0*##0#/
###/##

/###/###/##1/##4/##:/##;/##</##0/##0/##0/###0##00##00##00##00##00##00##1###1###1###
1##"1###1##\$1##&1##41##~1##□1##01##01##01###2##
2###2##

[illegible]

[illegible]

####

##3##0#####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0#####0#####0#####0##*##0##(##(###0#####0Q##\$##\$#
If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C 30#####40###
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0#0
#####0V#####
0#####
##3##0#####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0#####0#J###0#####0#0##0##8#8###0####

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

```
###0T##Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0#0
#####0V#####
0#####
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0
##0##8#8###0#####00###D#d#####0#0#0
#####0V#####
0#####
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0
##0##8#8###0#####0Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v##
#:V###0#0##6##0###50####C 30#####0#40###
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0##*<#####0V
#####
0#####
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#####0###*##0##( (###0#####0Q##$##$
If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C 30#####0#40###
###0T##Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0#0
#####0V#####
0#####
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0
##0##8#8###0#####00###D#d#####0#0#0
#####0V#####
0#### ####
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0
##0##8#8###0#####0Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v##
#:V###0#0##6##0###50####C 30#####0#40###
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0##*<#####0V
#####
0#####!####
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#####0###*##0##( (###0####
##0Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##Q##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####0#40###
###0T##0##$##$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
```

[illegible]

[illegible]

30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0#0
#####0V#####
0####+####
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0
##0##8#8###0####*##00####D#d#####0#0#0
#####0V#####
0####,###
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0
##0##8#8###0####+##0Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v##
#:V###0#0##6##0###50####C 30#####□#40###
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0#*<#####0V

0####-####
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#####0##*##0##(##(###0####,#0Q##\$##\$
If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C 30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0#0
#####0V#####
0####.####
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0##0##8#8###0####-
##00###D#d#####0#0#0#####0V#####
0####/####
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0
##0##8#8###0####.##0Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v##
#:V###0#0##6##0###50####C 30#####□#40###
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0#*<#####0V

0####0####
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#####0##*##0##(##(###0####/
##0Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C
30#####□#40###

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

```
#####x#####  
#####6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###v##  
#v###v###v###v###v###v###v###v###6###6###6###6###6###6###>###6###6###6###6###6##  
#6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6##  
#6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6##  
#6###6###6###6###6###6###6###h###H###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6##  
#6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6##  
#6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6##  
#6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6##  
#6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###p###6###2#####6###6###  
#6###6#####&###6###F###V###f###v###6###6###6###6###6###6###6#####2###(##  
#6###6###&###6###F###V###f###v###6###6###6###6###6###6###6#####&###6###F###V##  
#f###v###6###6###6###6###6###6#####&###6###F###V###f###v###6###6###6###6###  
#6###6#####&###6###F###V###f###v###6###6###6###6###6###6#####&###6##  
#F###V###f###v###6###6###6###6###6###6#####&###6###F###V###f###v###6###6##  
#8###X###6#####V###~###6###6###6###6###6###6###6#####  
###0###@###6#####  ###0###@###6#####  
###0###@###6#####  ###0###@###6#####  
###0###@###6#####  ###0###@###6#####  
###0###@###6#####  ###0###@###6#####  
###0###@###6#####  ###0###@###6#####  
###0###@###6#####  ###0###@###6#####  
###0###@###6#####  ###0###@###6#####  
#####_H##mH  
#nH  
#sH  
#tH  
#####<##`6##<#
```

#####N#o#r#m#a#l#####CJ##_H##mH
,sH
,tH

\##@####\#

#####T#t#u#l#o# #1#####d#d#@&#[\$#\####5#CJ0#KH\$#PJ##\#aJ0#mH

SH

X##@##"X#

#####T#t#u#l#o# #2#####d#d#@&#[\$#\####5#CJ\$#PJ##\#aJ\$#mH

SH

#####N#A 00#N#

#####Fu#e#n#t#e# #d#e# #p#r#r#a#f#o# #p#r#e#d#e#t#e#r#.#####V#i@#V#

#####0#

#T#a#b#l#a# #n#o#r#m#a#l### #:V###4#####4###
#l#a#####,#k ##,#####0# #S#i#n# #l#i#s#t#a#####

#####R#^@##0#R#

#####

#N#o#r#m#a#l# #(#W#e#b#)#####0d##0d#[\$#\###PJ##aJ##mH

SH

V#B@####V#

#####T#e#x#t#o# #i#n#d#e#p#e#n#d#i#e#n#t#e#####0x###PJ##aJ##mH

SH

PK#####!#00#00#####[Content_Types].xml000N00#E0H00-J00@#%0ăĚ|0ş\$#0
ج0U00L0TB0 #l,030;0r0##0000J00B+\$0#G]0070
*V00##<a0#00(700I00R0{0pgL0=00r#00008#05v&00#0uQ0# 800C00#00#X=000\$ 0?
6N0JC#000000F0#B.' '0.0+000Y0T0#00^e50500 0#0#đ

0_0g #-0;00000Yl06|00^0N0#`0?0#00[]###00##PK#####!
#00###6#####_rels/.rels000j00

000}000#%v/00C/0}#0(0h"#0#0000#
0#0000=000000 #00#00C?0h0v=000^00
%#[xp00{0_0Pb<01#0H000##0000R0Bd00#0JE04b\$00q_0#00#06L00#R07`00000000000,0E#n70
Lib00/0S000e00#e0000###00##PK#####!#ky0#0###0#####theme/theme/
themeManager.xml

0M

0 #@0}0w007c0(Eb0"00#C0#AÃk0000700#'KY,0#
0e0.000|,0#00H#0,l00#00x#N0#0I0sQ}#r0000 +0!0,0^0\$j=0GW000)0E0+&
#80###00##PK#####!#t]#0###0#####theme/theme/theme1.xml0YKo#7#0#0X
d0##0#0#70#00"GJK000.#000[00z)P -zh00z(0#h0#000#pL?0C0j0000##
[0000f0qf83s0iL0#0#aI0/0*0#N0, I00#000=!Q# 0#00gX0w0?00#}#00#00B?0r000&0000-60
<#1## 0<\#8:#01][0jk1"00%(#0}00#0#0Fd0000#09#)000R03###00
!f0E0w0hÇ0#v00000Q\$<h0%00m0YC[0#0+d0000020`00000 00R0Vj;0~0r#
vwj0Z00#0p#+M00:00J05@0Cw000([xC00#0YxJ0W000n#0h05(0W0000f0m0#_[00K;0J0yA#%0x
]006Z000#00N0f0t0g0##DC#]j0#K0X0010]#(E0\$00M0#!0[00#'0# ##0 J0000z0[
پ00W0Wفh##CZ0#&biH00D00l00A0o@09{00000g40=050[000vQ#0r0~0_z0000#÷S/
j00Wo000}0aN)o{0000000##0;#Lx00Xx#00{0bX00?#0I0#DL00\$\$(Aj#0000,00

Q0050m00#R0#xozl#0E|*0C0(0000&0N+<Ps#f0000=90000#000n000rg:0#K\
*[#0h#Q0H#0#K0=cc0#0{B0e0}20L000#0000\$}2000#0%10e0"#00l000k20Zu#00H0#0:00100x#M
%0]*0(0000\\${3>4q#!00!000#X#00!
00#N[]#i000}:0m\$0d0w0#30m6nE(000=0D&0s10#E0#0.0>0w00#?
0d00##l000l0#20I0##0d0#0000#00##!
0J5;<0R0#'00hNC+00000###{0>w0h00e000#00.v#0}dQ0000nn000##V00p0V◆-
\$0#Jb0Wi>#0060@00]#pH0c#x@0#0xq#0P0##0Wj=00U0hup00[000#0}ylyl'##|
e#H00{m0GQ0#0>0.0nA0r[]!000#0:0F0-0#[]000\$00#Z0}00]0##00#/
#0000;n0V00b00*00.070p0]M00|0MM#M0#

ud9c0047=0000iV00NfU0q0000a0t200ı0d00#0#u0#00c0x0ψP3_00>0#0>#taP003000#N"0Te#&0p
!GZ00L~AdHu0#N0'R#0Lu(0

#ph0000#0N0}#0000:0L+0@0#/U0q800)0V/#0r0m0#Z0#00UH#00\$6#\$00Ae\$}0#Fs00+0 ,6#,n+0s
W-0#j0W0□00_00##0y#400S00w03?00W#H#h00#PxzSq]0<0040.0i00#n6
m#00#^000T000qU_o#.00)S00 0
#000cq]_00bn000)h0600F#Bf0&□#00p#0 v0z0B40o/C00□0020B000R0□
f00H0=Jı0000&:0hn0uH##-0MH+##9p00d<#040n0(K00000\0|0û#V0l
00E070S0#A0U0ee0#0vPN0##0#0'0"0#
S0vQ:00qD'#0*000S0N09#}00000

#5L0#0A0
0iT000U# 0^,0,g\$fZYEUW#0f000#[^00#00&00fV04u/000y0[0#0*##00
0(##0b200b000U00F001_0#0.S\$00_00]0[^#0000*?0-F-

00}0000nn~0f0cH#m0r0T
0J0l0#4D=0iC0n0###00##PK#####!#
è00#####'###theme/theme/_rels/themeManager.xml.rels00M
00#00w#ooF#0&00#0056?\$Q00
0, #.0a00i0000#c201h0##:0q00m00@R#N00;d0`00o70#g0K(M&\$R(.10r#'J00HT0800V0"00A00H0
u}00#|0\$0b#{0##0P00008#0g/##]0QAs,(0000#00L#0[0000###00##PK##-#####!
#00#00#####[Content_Types].xmlPK##-#####!
#00###6#####0###_rels/.relsPK##-#####!
#ky0#0###0#####theme/theme/themeManager.xmlPK##-#####!
#t]#0###0#####0###theme/theme/theme1.xmlPK##-#####!#
è00#####'
##theme/theme/_rels/themeManager.xml.relsPK#####]###0
####<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8" standalone="yes"?>
<a:clrMap xmlns:a="http://schemas.openxmlformats.org/drawingml/2006/main"
bg1="lt1" tx1="dk1" bg2="lt2" tx2="dk2" accent1="accent1" accent2="accent2"
accent3="accent3" accent4="accent4" accent5="accent5" accent6="accent6"
hlink="hlink" folHlink="folHlink"/>####.#####0000####
##0### ##x)##0,##01###5##

:##T>###C##J##LS##b##f##j##hn##s###v###y###<##*,###
##h#####m#####4##
#######\$'##^'##2##07##=##kB##0##`##e##Ji##q###v#####E##
#######P##e#####I#####R#####0#####
#####\####G###y###,0##Y9##<##@##yE##\L##R##d###i##\
j###\###t##z##m~##B##c##ψ###6##^##ð####}## #####z##
 P#####S##E###Y
#######

[illegible]

```
##### #"#####  
%###&###(###+###,###.###0###2###6###:###<###?  
###A###D###H###L###N###P###R###U###Y#####8#####@  
##0####00####0#000#0#####0#####00#####0(#####  
    0#####  
0#####0B#####  
0#####S##0####0####0#####0########?  
#####0#####  
%###0###>###E###F###P###Q###S###[###g###h###o###p###u###v###y###z###~###[]###0###  
0###0###0###0###?###K###W###\  
###}###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###  
#####9###=###>###F###0###R###`###i###j###n###r###z###|  
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###  
###0###0###0####.#.#####  
#####  
#####a
```

##e

##0

##0

#####0##0##0##0##0###
###0###0###0###0###0###0###3###7###0###0###0###.##
.###3###3###3###3###3###3###3###3###3###3###3#####0#####
###07/#050#####.##
.#####0@#####.#####L#####0###0##00##00##
0-###.##0####@##0##0####0##0#@##0###0####0##0#@##0###h
@##00#####U#n#k#n#o#w#n#00#####00#####00#####00#####00#####G#0
#####0.#0[x#0 #####0#####T#i#m#e#s# #N#e#w#
#R#o#m#a#n###5#0#####0####S#y#m#b#o#l###3.0#####
###0.#0[x#0

#####0#####A#r#i#a#l###I#0#####A#r#i#a#l#
#U#n#i#c#o#d#e# #M#S###C.,#####0.#0{\$#0#####0#####C#a#l#i#b#r#i#
#L#i#g#h#t###7.0#####0.#0{\$#0

#####0#####C#a#l#i#b#r#i###A#0#####0##0\$#B#####0#####C#a#m#b#r#
i#a# #M#a#t#h###"###1#0##00###0#####Q30F#00G#####00##i0##?
#"#####0###00##i0##?"###0#####!
##0#####

#####7#S
#Z#0#00#0#####0+##0+#####
#####J0Q#0###00#####0@P#### 0##
\$P##0#####00000000000000000000050#####2#####!
#####x###x#####0#####0#####00####
#####M#a#g#i#s#t#r#i# #P#e#t#r#i# #L#o#m#b#a#r#d#i#A#r#c#h#####V#I#C#T#0#R#
#B#A#S#T#E#R#R#E#T#C#H#E###c#a#r#l#o#s#
#s#a#n#c#h#e#z#####

#####00##
#####0000h#00##+'000###0#####0#####0#####0##
#####0#####0#####

##\$#####0###
###P###

[illegible]

#####h#####p#####|
#####@#####@#####@#####@#####@#####@#####@###

#####"#####+#####
#####Magistri Petri LombardiArch#

[illegible]

```
#####  
###!##"$#####$###%###&###'###(###)###*###+###,###-###.###/###0###1###2###3###4  
###5###6###7###8###9###:###;###<###=###>###?  
###@###A###B###C###D###E###F###G###H###I###J###K###L###M###N###O###P###Q###R###S  
###T###U###V###W###X###Y###Z###[###\  
###]###^###_###`###a###b###c###d###e###f###g###h###i###j###k###l###m###n###o###p  
###q###r###s###t###u###v###w###x###y###z###{###|  
###}###~###[]###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0  
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0  
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0  
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0  
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0  
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0  
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0  
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0  
000Yqh□0n000k00#J0#vn0HP/0K0w000200#3f0□0#8#ˆg$000 0#  
□0#~00500F0r0B #0t0J00#~#□#0f.}<60~##0□□rd00I#3ia000P0V[0-050#0#0#00|#  
□0aq0#0H0c#0000P'q0[00f0J]_00tJ0^#50#0#ypTI%y000(0~ 00#n#0W00  
0#00u0T0#0>900#a000^:9g#000+00#ka000U0D|0#0;q00SÜ0□01$IP000EX0# 0-o#□?(u0#0000  
□0X 00~00>00p0q0x0i50d0jb00J0+U0□*n0<GGY#000#0qC0000m0k#00V}
```

□.0##K0xP0000o00000Da!0'0y=#gu0
X6#0Y000p0F000s0=0,0#Z0G090030hV#=00_000*0#0aF0000Ny0QBq0^000#]0o000□K0!X0w00T?
fB0C4##j0}0900#g□S0H00□Ĝl0FT00ηw0a00n00VI2%0Q;"00000Q+00'=L□0Iñ:"c0000004/
_00#i>>00M00*□]~0#0;0l00f00x0#
%900y00R03T00]0###j40C00#0000i:□0e##f*00V0f<00f000#H0%0

&z#*00b#0Y0'0C00#<0#00140}00#00#0:0] 000V+000b00u#YNU0#0000`000n0000B000|
0=u0#000r#0##0JX000#]0fmY000#009#000G@e04QiRBP(0d000y0z0
v0h00[0000o0##+!00[.,0o0bM00tz0`xg000Z00A
0000{#009#000##00,004##0#'Gx0G000Gp;E;?00u0rY-00sk0F+#0
0##00hz0b0000T#0i00'0"Ut00WN00kD00#>p7c0R00?0V00#0YJ000##0@0v00FG0##|
0#K0010#0W#0ud0\0000#q0kUN00fYB0,0#00z000_w}R400(0#Yll0g0000B0F%800
2TN000#800kWv0>01#0>I0]000#!6Q00\7
oC000#0##000!:00wB000^_#00b0k]000h000^0#1_P0j00^?
0080GR00r#Y0~n000#00_00;p0A00V†0u0q#vG0#000#w0oj0Y.0
ea0#}01Um000]j0V00+`R0(r00l00580D0(#0
}#?s#000C0]Z00#0000r000-#00#>V̂k
Q00#03#00≤0m#000#0000(d0=V/000ā7{00`;S{0#00<+|X000!0R0Ui!\
0#pj0qh000G#0s##E0c0##0]#00fyя00q02#0rP00_!00000"00n7000^00&0İ##0VB#0B00
o#00#w00##(0CW00#0
!0IM0#&'08#m0#000#00Q`&P#0#t^"n000B0W0Kh0xG/00)00`/00###C3=080X00#W0D"=00#|
e0#06X00000##QyJ0_#000<000##000"0q000I
00/7#00-0\$

000|#000090)###K0\$00#0t003<í0r00S#0t0801;0#0#xc00#00'0#/000000w0#00006;A0]-
0g#0000.0X0A!#0B=aK^0|007)00`0#N,}0(0VOW5000 000b000<0λ
8%Ms0SnJ}0.000#000B#0000WD#q0*0,0D00#0IA90u00#0w0{00f00o000#0_0d0
%D#00#0W00Σ0;0j0000#0#00W000##s#a#00#00<0_0v0#0dZ#000#00lh0be8#0000r07!
~0;0*0ü00#0N0=@A00000z}E3#0#c0P0-0w#8;0}0gp0:0#00#00`0E#00m0Z000000a\$x010Si01?
0M0##00#DSL)0r0##0_C000#c#T0#0#000#!00_0?
S0=T000z00W#00k00hr0y#0230R00##00ZHzv00#0#0+0iJ0E0H000Ě00
#00000PX40cŮ100e#'0d61:00780000"#0#0H0e;80[]0#.YC000<0qR0W#GT0g00d0#q00#ca0503(#
0Q0"00k00;0<000@b0[]##[]00=[0Y0cE)|000:0#tjy0h%0#0y0#000#0oLu0s0000n#00#0e0\
v00e0#0\$000t0G00#0000#F0/BL000D0q#T0F00'F#0&%P#0b0:0p000^0sB0w###o00b
0[]p#`S0*d0@)00(L0u=0!0_0,0<d#0G#%~0jn####0t/0C000z^#0

0u00e0#0#703lw#C00b#0Z0^A
#}PGRh0K00800000K20Y/9H000

eGr0#\#0S!000D'0#000!k0w00d#E000?c0R\$0000+0]|

#y

G0000#0Q0& M}0###/0 H70r#?000l}0#0Tn000##l00KX040#0f#00b0N0d000t
0n+DC(#0w1S0h0Y0Z00#00A{#0T.B00#0`\$0hY00:Z
000#p0 E0n0e#0]

000#|0#n>C[006000T0 00#[o090
0#0'εPA0wz###Q0|~0`#0#0g*2F0\z0#0000!}

8\v0 00 /!0~0f0Z002000:0t00S0#t5000##00?00000h000přX#fj#
7#jA+0E#0#0V000#000f0ZG0#Ln00000#060i=0+00#M#,{)m.K

0b0400q0p`000f=007IjQ00080310}0j000#c#�Y0#;s0#00#00000#t0H0000,002#0000_!
0900} B00s0 0<x#ec0J#0i00v0aN00lI00
%#\$070005#0#0#005f00#0000#0R0XH8w70#4I00S0\$0??0V-c0#0#[000ض
3.Cf}0u0000=0000@000NW.00q0&0wM0000(8%6u00w00K#kW000e00E00(0if&P90#}WS#00h

I#0S
##00;J

_0ux0t]#0Fg0.00<c#00!00001080b00#u~00##0Jw00#000{0
%00#Jj0'0T00#00;#0Veu0d0#00Q#0V00###03*(00000~k00#r000Z0v0L0n0 #0g#% PV0Sb#Ť0
%#00B0:00\0j00K!#X06}{00#0|!0{/Y00*00#0 *`A#00000#ě=00#Vdl 0-[tt00!00yM!
0#00000t00000r00l000k00P3#0J:kT0#0400000^00I;0#0000 0 0n00%000_S0000
pГ#G#0'#00wW000"o+00000#0N#0Q[000#0,#0i00#000L0DD0|Q#I0000zw!r##30ÿ0

mS0)00#0L00L0#50000h0u0ps#v0#<00\$6U-04 0~0!00#00v000e00)##00u00###m#0|
00G06#u#00B
#005]000H00000rW0j2000 10d0Q0jy0L00s#z["0}0###02~0s/NK0A#0
%00'M0q00Q#200B>0#0Y0IX@;g0##0H0000nawz0c00?000\$,ŮwY00j0+{m0(0##0000T0
Fn,#o#0##0_I0Je0R000G0ycF0#0E00 n:0000,00>00000'0щ00;0j00)0-#00000E000000"z00#0-
000#00#y0#`00m0.0\$vf 0#j{E0#B000í0|0v+9<!9t0I0X#60# 0~S#0Σ`00XYS0j00Z#00
0_S:#00z0#=#0/0

\K0P00#I0dN0s90dz0Y02#0#uT0x0k000]#x000##00#f9000p0z@00w0J#00+0u0\$0=y0##(00##

0#0B0##0'#0>`X026(0R00#000h004|#0?#x0Y0#00XH000q0j0;00^0p000A0##00p#0p#g0#+a008
00~00#0J0v0;0#00Y_;0č00#(#0J#0#0j0080S000_#0#07jW0%U00^00}*00600PM#00&0xa|
0000#00p.0#00#'#00Rh/0{c0Z##r0W0
00x

#03050}02#00#0T0T0wA#0L0U00#x0cFgV0S0"000W0#00t00?=>u#0K?R000Ii
J6}◆F#_0#00930000□0h0#00
□

0yR0/000zt0#000Y00 000K0#900
#0 C0`<;H 0\0003yp0#00-0¬p}00w b00E##0#|0%جu00#b000

#I#000#G-030/pq0t0{0N8060&.#000<0V0a#000#I0(Y00000]G00+
#Y0#]000#00003[000#0#\~#>00<00#*#|0q0+\0#0400p#0K,00`00J#W#00H0mG|
0M00w]0#0G0#D]0Xq0(y0EH00} 00.0yr`G900 U000r000+WI0000Q~00qC#0A00d0,50V'i0|
0h,0r0#|*_000}0K(0a00L#030p_g000000"00#ف00#f040k0B#000(B0f00)'0S060t(00800#00
000#00#

9#^0DT#B00^0^00#000
\$a0b00AoD0p#00i
#i00 ,H0000g0*#Q/bK00#00#00&+0` 0A#'#0T#0000P0y0#0C00#0@3P0#>,Z{ #qY
0#.\00A0c0a80p=0##0}00,7j je#000#&00s#0bF00z00n00000\$007y0T0(SV0ga.0#0?
00{#0w#|###Zw0I#00?04(000*
/0d05E>0034p#00#0H0#00S0#0|0B0##0G0#0j#0v0nn0>0aS#k#0zL0#R0)0a0#K0P0#0U!t0\#
'[00-k000Z0t00#0#00KV##`00#00+#`.22[,fR0& w50i#00hX000?)/00+#0#00d0#0
00000#00#00J#0u